THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

VOL. XLIV. No. 259 JANUARY, 1942

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Thoughts on an Armistice - - - *Charles Smyth*

The Liturgical Tradition in English Verse *M. C. Bradbrook*

God and History - - - - - *The Bishop of Derby*

The *Great* Church - - - - - *Gilbert Shaw*

Revised Reviews : No. 11
Streeter's *Four Gospels* - - - - *L. J. Collins*

Survey of Books on Religious Education - *W. J. Brown*

For full list of contents see within.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

1s. 6d. per copy. 15s. per annum, post free.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester. (MSS should not exceed 4,000 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)
Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Advisory Committee

The Rev. Canon F. A. Cockin.
The Rev. L. J. Collins.
The Rev. F. L. Cross, D.Phil.
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.
Ashley Sampson.

33268

Collaborators

(The following are in general sympathy with the aims of *Theology* and are willing in various ways to give it their assistance, but they are not committed by the editorial policy in particular matters.)

The Rev. H. K. Archdall.
Montgomery Belgion.
The Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, B.D.
Prof. T. S. R. Boase.
F. Brittain.
Leonard Browne, M.D.
Miss K. E. Chester.
The Rev. A. A. Cock.
The Rev. F. N. Davey.
The Rev. H. S. Deighton.
E. W. Edmonds.
T. S. Eliot.
Miss D. M. Emmet.
Bro. George Every, S.S.M.
The Rev. A. M. Farrer.
The Rev. S. L. Greenslade.
The Rev. Prof. L. W. Grensted, D.D.
The Rev. H. StJ. Hart.
The Rev. H. C. L. Heywood.
The Rev. Prof. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys.
The Rev. Canon W. L. Knox, B.D.
The Rev. F. E. P. S. Langton.
The Very Rev. the Provost of Leicester.
C. S. Lewis.
The Rev. Prof. R. H. Lightfoot, D.D.
The Rev. Ronald Lunt.
Donald Mackinnon.
The Rev. Prof. F. S. Marsh.
The Rev. E. L. Mascall.
The Rev. Guy Mayfield.
The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.
The Rev. T. R. Milford.
J. Middleton Murry.
The Rev. Arnold Nash, M.Sc.
Joseph Needham, Sc.D., F.R.S.
The Rev. A. Otter.
The Rev. Prof. O. C. Quick, D.D.
The Rev. Prof. A. M. Ramsey.
The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff.
The Rev. Alan Richardson, B.D.
Michael Roberts.
The Very Rev. the Dean of St Paul's.
The Rev. George Seaver, B.D.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Sheffield.
John Short.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.
The Rev. A. M. Stockwood.
The Rev. Prof. R. V. G. Tasker, B.D.
Miss B. Hamilton Thompson.
The Rev. Oliver Tomkins.
The Rev. C. D. Waddams.
Gilbert N. Walton.
The Rev. M. A. C. Warren.
Charles Williams.
The Headmaster of Winchester.

Editorial Representatives in U.S.A. (to whom MSS and communications from American writers should be sent):

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, New York.
The Rev. Powel M. Dawley, Ph.D., St David's Church, Roland Park, Baltimore.

Collaborators in U.S.A.

Prof. George R. Elliott, Litt.D.
The Rev. Canon John Crocker. [S.T.D.
The Very Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbroke,
The Rev. Leicester C. Lewis, S.T.D.
The Rev. Charles W. Lowry, D.Phil.
Prof. William A. Orton.
Allen Tate.

Other Representatives Abroad:

Ireland: The Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford, B.D., Trinity College, Dublin.
South Africa: The Rev. C. H. S. Runge, C.R., Rosettenville, Johannesburg.
N. India: The Rev. J. R. Peacey, Bishop's College, Calcutta.
S. India: The Ven. T. G. Stuart Smith, C.M.S., Tholashery, Tiruvalla, Travancore.
Australia: The Rev. G. Stuart Watts, 90 Pitt Street, Sydney.
Canada: The Rev. R. K. Naylor, Diocesan Theological College, Montreal.

THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIV JANUARY, 1942 No. 259

Thoughts on an Armistice

A SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD ON REMEMBRANCE SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1941

Mark viii, 15: *And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod.*

NEXT Tuesday marks the twenty-third anniversary of the signing of the Armistice: and it is noteworthy that year by year since that cessation of hostilities we have continued to keep the Armistice, although we have not kept the Peace. There is something deeply significant in a nation's choice of anniversaries, and none would deny that November 11, 1918, has meant far more to us than June 28, 1919. This may be partly, as Chesterton suggested some years before the renewal of open conflict in September 1939, because the world, weary of war as it has hardly ever been weary in all the ages, has never in all that intervening time dared finally to announce peace with Prussia.[1] But I should say rather that it is primarily because November 11 is the natural and obvious day on which to commemorate our dead; and secondarily because we have never quite forgotten and never quite abandoned those high and generous hopes associated in the minds of most of us with the first memories of that deliverance. In memorable words the Prime Minister announced the news to Parliament: "Thus, Mr Speaker, at 11 o'clock this morning came to an end the cruellest and most terrible war that has ever scourged mankind. I hope we may say that thus this fateful morning came to an end all wars." Across the Atlantic, the President of the United States was even more explicit: "My fellow-countrymen: The armistice was signed this morning. Everything for which America fought has been

[1] G. K. Chesterton, *The End of the Armistice* (ed. F. J. Sheed), p. 15.

[2] *Cf.* leading article, "Peace For Ever", in the *Nation*, November 16, 1918 (vol. xxiv, p. 180): "At last the blessed hour has struck which restores life and light to the earth. . . . The gigantic sin of war, plenteously purged by the blood of innocence, is no more. . . . At last we have found the cure of war. . . ." *Cf.* also Mr H. G. Wells's celebrated slogan (October, 1914), "*The War That Will End War.*"

accomplished. It will now be our fortunate duty to assist by example, by sober, friendly counsel, and by material aid, in the establishment of just democracy throughout the world." The Archbishop of Canterbury was indeed comparatively guarded: " It is too early now to speak as though a clear course on lines of peace lay open before us." Yet even he spoke of the whole life of the world as " being re-conditioned, re-established, re-set for good. . . . The cause for which we and our Allies have striven, the cause which brought England and America into the war, has, under God's good hand, prevailed, and its opposite—the principle of sheer physical force and the will to power—has been definitely and for ever barred from being the dominant factor in the life of civilized man. Something higher, deeper, worthier of men with immortal souls, has proved the conqueror, with a conquest which shall not be overset."[1] At the simple service in St Margaret's, Westminster, to which the members of both Houses of Parliament adjourned to offer their thanksgiving to Almighty God, he read the Lesson. It was from the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah, and two verses of it in particular, said *The Times*, moved the congregation profoundly. " He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound. . . . They shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities." But—*Nisi Dominus ædificet:* Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it. Those high and generous hopes were hopes engendered in war-weariness; and by war-weariness they were frustrated and betrayed.

For in the lives of nations, as of individuals, fatigue is the normal and inevitable punishment of what the theologians term Pelagianism—that is, of self-reliance and of self-sufficiency, as opposed to a humble and sustained dependence upon God. Of all the Devil's weapons against man's soul, fatigue is perhaps the most subtle and the most insidious. Fatigue supplies material for all the seven deadly sins—pride, anger, envy, avarice, gluttony, lust and sloth. It ministers to self-pity, it makes men irritable and contentious, it undermines their sense of purpose and vocation, it tempts them to let slip their spiritual life-lines of private prayer and public worship, and lures them to seek un-

[1] Archbishop Davidson, *The Testing of a Nation*, pp. 163, 159-60.

worthy compensations, of which drunkenness and fornication are the most conspicuous only by reason of their grossness, while others, such as thoughts and states of jealousy, malice, hatred, are in truth more deadly because less easily admitted and repented; and all the time, at every turn, it offers itself as an excuse. And one of the most dangerous manifestations of fatigue—most dangerous, because the sense of personal guilt and personal responsibility is at a minimum—is what men call war-weariness, which is a mass-phenomenon, and which is experienced by the individual as a weariness both of the flesh and of the spirit.

These are the times that try men's souls. There may be no abatement of our resolution, of our perseverance, of our confidence of final victory. Yet as the war moves on inexorably to its climax, it is not going to become easier even for Christian men and women to struggle against the spiritual deterioration which is the inevitable danger of all intensifying conflicts, however just in origin or exalted in their ultimate purpose.[1] Indeed, the more just the origin of the conflict and the more exalted its purpose, by so much the greater is the danger of a progressive spiritual deterioration. Of this, the classical example is, I suppose, the history of the Crusades; consequently, the fact that in a society so largely secularized as our own the word " crusade ", however loosely or incongruously employed, retains an obvious propaganda value, is undoubtedly disquieting.[2] For there is a considerable grain of truth in Luther's paradox that all wars are legitimate except holy wars.[3]

Fortunately, in this respect, our motives in declaring war on Germany in 1939 were, on the whole, so realistic, and the conflict upon which we are engaged is so nakedly a struggle for self-preservation, that there has been less temptation—and less opportunity—than there was twenty-five years ago for the secular idealists to sell it to the public as a holy war, or with an almost indecent precipitancy to write it off after the termination of hostilities as damaged

[1] *Vide* Editorial, " Into the Third Year ", by M. B. R[eckitt], in *Christendom*, September, 1941 (vol. xi, p. 134).

[2] We may note, however, that already in the U.S.A. the word " Crusader " is in common use in a derogatory sense—*e.g.*, Isolationists ridicule Interventionists as " Crusaders ".

[3] One might further argue that no war is ever right when it is fought for a *positive* purpose, this being (more or less) the secular equivalent of a holy war.

stock. So far as public opinion is concerned, our entry into the war of 1914-18 because Germany had violated the neutrality of Belgium was a far more altruistic business; and precisely for that reason it was far more difficult as the war continued, and after it was over, to maintain our sense of balance and proportion. The post-war lie that all wars are "meaningless" and "futile"[1] was only a reaction against the war-time lie that all Germans were criminals and barbarians; both were alike repugnant to Christian realism, and both might have been avoided if we had realized from the outset that the State belongs to the divine order *as a secular institution*, having as its appointed function the maintenance of law and order and the defence of the lives and properties of its subjects against invasion; and not as a sort of localized embodiment of the Kingdom of God, charged with the vindication of the righteousness of God in every quarter of the globe. "When the State speaks we must not expect to hear a confession of Christian Faith",[2] nor when it acts must we expect to see a demonstration of the Divine Justice. The present war is not, in that sense, a crusade; but it is, as Barth defines it, "a large-scale police measure which has become absolutely necessary in order to repulse an active anarchism which has become a principle".[2] It is true also that we are fighting against evil things—brute force, bad faith, oppression and injustice; that we have reason to be confident that our cause is just; and that (to quote Barth again) "the obedience of the Christian to the clear will of God compels him to support this war".[2] But the moment we have said all that, we must remember our Lord's solemn warning to His Church: "Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees. . . ."

I

The leaven of the Pharisees is hypocrisy: play-acting[3]; not so much, I think—taking the word in the context of

[1] And that "War settles nothing", a myth which is duly punctured in Professor D. W. Brogan's *Is Innocence Enough?* (p. 55), but which, be it remembered, amounted almost to a dogma among British pacifists and is now enjoying a considerable vogue in Isolationist circles in America.

[2] Karl Barth, *A Letter to Great Britain from Switzerland* (1941), pp. 12, 21, 9.

[3] *Cf.* Appendix, "A Brief Examination of the Meaning of ὑποκριτής", in *Talmudic Judaism and Christianity*, by Canon A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., pp. 67 *ff.*

our Lord's recorded sayings—the conscious and habitual pretending to be better than one knows one is in order to deceive others, but rather that almost unconscious self-deception which is the fruit of spiritual pride and spiritual assurance, and which our Lord describes as "leaven" because it is so insidious in its working, permeating the whole character and outlook of its victim. "If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth" (John ix, 41). Under present conditions, it is perhaps pre-eminently the temptation—not the sin, but the temptation—of the Pacifist, not because he is a Pacifist, but because he is a member of a small minority which honestly and inevitably believes the majority to be both intellectually and morally in the wrong. Secondly, it is the temptation of the ordinary non-combatant, of the people who hate the Germans, and of the people who are too enlightened to hate the Germans but who hate the people who hate the Germans, and also of ordinary decent people like ourselves who are not directly interested in the controversy and who can accordingly feel morally superior to both parties. ("I am of Vansittart": "And I of Laski": "And I of Christ"!)

And there are other questions. Take the "V" sign. Does that "V" stand for Victory, or for Vengeance? Or is it possible that we say the one and mean the other? It is a matter of historic record that under the influence of war-weariness men say and do things of which in their normal moments they would be ashamed, and respond to stimuli against which under happier auspices they would react with considerable violence. "The demand for a huge indemnity to be exacted from conquered Germany makes a powerful appeal to the sense of justice in those who rightly hold Germany responsible for the war. . . . If some vindictiveness get mixed up with the demand for justice, that cannot be helped." In these words the *Nation*[1] not unfairly summarized, while it deprecated the unwisdom of, the attitude of the Man-in-the-street on the eve of the first Armistice. But there were lower depths. In the *Weekly Dispatch* of Sunday, September 10, 1918, there

[1] Article, "How Far can Germany Pay for the War?" in the *Nation*, November 2, 1918 (vol. xxiv, p. 127). In Hugh Kingsmill's anthology, *What They Said at the Time*, p. 178, this passage is unfortunately quoted without its context, as though it represented the *Nation's* own considered views on the subject.

appeared an article by a prominent Northcliffe journalist in which he gloated over the alleged effects of our blockade upon the future of the German race, and quoted as follows from an interview with an eminent medical authority, who may be nameless: " If German parents of to-day are mal-nourished, or under-fed, or semi-starved, or poisoned by the thousand and one so-called weird food ' substitutes ' on which they are now existing, their offspring will be correspondingly inferior products. They will be subject to a vast variety of hereditary ailments. They will be less able to resist infections like tuberculosis. They may be crippled, deformed, or under-sized. What is certain is that no amount of dumb-bells, Indian clubs, or Prussian barrack-yard drill —no amount of gymnastics in the Germans' vaunted ' Turnverein '—can straighten the legs or arms of the children of mal-nourished parents or pump good red blood into their anæmic veins, or otherwise modify the permanent marks which Nature will have imprinted upon their defective constitutions. . . . That means that in 1940 there will in all probability be a race of German physical degenerates."[1] The article was entitled " The Huns of 1940 . . ." But that, of course, was twenty-three years ago. To-day, at least, of all the European peoples the English are probably the most scrupulous about reprisals, and all the efforts of certain journalists and of certain popular newspapers to fan the flames of hatred have been singularly fruitless in face of public apathy; yet the same instinct for a moral issue which makes us scrupulous about reprisals also makes us feel that our enemies are appropriate subjects for divine retribution, and that they ought (as we say) to be taught a lesson, to be given a dose of their own medicine, though preferably by our heroic Allies (and no questions asked) rather than by ourselves. This sort of attitude is quite understandable; but we can see, I think, why foreigners are apt to mistake it for hypocrisy. God knows the secrets of our hearts: we know them only on our knees, and then not always nor completely. " Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees. . . ."

[1] Quoted in *England's Holy War : A Study of English Liberal Idealism during the Great War*, by Irene Cooper Willis (edition in one volume, New York, 1928), pp. 294-5 *n.* This sort of thing seems to have been fairly generally believed; *cf.*, *e.g.*, article, " The Infamy of the Blockade ", in the *Nation*, March 8, 1919 (vol. xxiv, p. 663), " The German people have been overworked and undernourished for years. . . . The next generation of Germany will be partly cretin."

II

" . . . And of the leaven of Herod." What is the leaven of Herod? Surely it is that interesting worldliness, that affable sophistication which conveys an inescapable suggestion of good taste, that urbane, accommodating temper which is based not upon genuine tolerance but on deep-rooted cynicism and astute self-interest. It is not irrelevant that Herod was a sort of quisling. But the truth lies deeper yet. The leaven of Herod is, in the last analysis, the spirit of irreligion, the being conformed to this world on the assumption that there is no other, the worldly wisdom which denies the very possibility of absolute truth and of absolute values, a fundamental scepticism which pleads as its authority a superficial observation of human frailties and of human follies, and whose even surface is ruffled only by occasional spasms of credulity. Our Lord well took its measure: " Go ye and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils . . . " (Luke xiii, 32). For the pretensions of worldly wisdom to supply an adequate philosophy of life break down at the irruption into human experience of a supernatural authority which it can neither master nor explain. " For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness " (1 Cor. iii, 19). The Gospel of the Kingdom may be very rough and crude in comparison with the maturity of the Herodian mind and the urbanity of the Herodian manner, but it is never taken in by either and it goes bluntly to the point: " It is not lawful for thee to have her." For it is pure sophistry to pretend that all morality is simply the product of convention, that all values are merely relative, that there is no such thing as Right and Wrong but only Expediency and Inexpediency; such sophistry may seem very plausible, but there *are* absolute standards, and God is not mocked—and neither is the Devil.

Is it not true that the present crisis of our civilization is, to a large extent, directly attributable to the working of this leaven of Herod? Some of you may perhaps recall a rather remarkable book[1] about Germany by a Frenchman, Pierre Viénot, which was published in 1931 in an English translation with the ill-omened and indeed misleading title, *Is Germany Finished?* One of the chapters in it was called " The Fatality of Relativism ". For, as the author

[1] *Incertitudes Allemandes.*

pointed out, in any historic culture " it is not so much the arts and letters or the degree of material progress that arrest our attention, but rather the moral principle which, at the period in question, serves as the basis of collective life and justifies its order ", and " *of which the absolute value is never questioned* ".[1] In Germany that was destroyed, not by defeat, but by the Inflation and by the economic crises which succeeded it. There were no more certainties. *πάντα ῥεῖ*. A German philosopher of that epoch wrote: " For the first time in ten thousand years, man sees himself as a total and undecipherable enigma. For he no longer knows what he is, and he knows that he does not know."[1] Despite the stubborn rearguard action put up by traditional groups such as the Churches and, to some extent, the Army, it seemed impossible to imagine any longer a state of collective beliefs which should ensure collective order. " No belief any longer appears absolute. None can escape from our consciousness of its historical particularity or its social function. All are dead and done with. The links they forged between man and man are broken for ever. . . . We know to-day that never again shall we escape from this clairvoyant self-consciousness; it is the millstone round the neck of modern man, and it will pin him down for ever in the midst of a final relativity."[1] The writer then surveyed the collapse of moral, political, and economic standards in the Weimar Republic, and added prophetically: " It is obvious that this uncertainty may easily turn to despair and violence. In particular, there is no doubt that the microbe of National-Socialism has found in the uncertainty which now ravages Germany the culture necessary to its development."[1] All that was published in 1931; since when the tension of an intolerable relativity, denying what Mozley called " the inextinguishable appetite of human nature for the distinct and definite and positive, in truth or error, as may be,"[2] has been resolved with violence by the Revolution of Destruction. For the leaven of Herod—the intellectual assumption that all values are purely relative and that all truths are tentative and ephemeral—constitutes no revolutionary menace to the whole fabric of the social order *only* in the context of material security, and *only* when its operation is restricted to the few.

[1] *Is Germany Finished?* (Faber, 1931), pp. 20, 24 (Scheler), 23-5, 76.
[2] J. B. Mozley, *Essays Historical and Theological* (essay on Lord Strafford), vol. i, p. 2.

Nor is it Germany alone that is in question. The Western democracies have not stood immune from the infection of this fatality of relativism. There has indeed been no such catastrophic disruption of beliefs and no such violent reaction; but there has been a gradual rotting from within, which has already spread so far that for us also in some measure it seems wellnigh impossible to imagine any longer a state of collective belief which shall ensure collective order. Whether in hope or in despair, without conviction, without much readiness to accept and still less to envisage the discipline that they propose, we clutch at catchwords—Christianity, Democracy, Freedom, Planning, Equality of Educational Opportunity—with the spasmodic energy of doomed men clutching at floating straws. It was said of the Victorian Age, regarded from one aspect, that it was an age destitute of faith yet terrified of scepticism. In this present epoch of Postmodernism, when men are less acutely conscious of their need of a philosophy of faith and conduct, that age of serious, heart-searching, agonizing intellectual doubts seems almost unbelievably remote. The normal young men or young women of our generation are even more cheerfully indifferent to scepticism than they are to faith. And it is not an easy thing to preach the Gospel to materialists who are not even interested in Materialism. This also is the leaven of Herod. It is what Huizinga, in his *In the Shadow of Tomorrow : A Diagnosis of the Spiritual Distemper of our Time* (1935), described as the " deterioration of the intellectual conscience ", the " disavowal of the intellectual principle ",[1] the dispensing with any objective, external, authoritative frame of reference for belief and practice. And this *Seinsverbundenheit des Denkens*, this " existentially-conditionedness of thought "—the very phrase is borrowed from the sociologists of the Weimar Republic[2]—issues, and can issue, only in a dreary pragmatism which deprives the concept, truth, of its claim to absolute validity by placing it in the flow of time.

To this disavowal of the intellectual principle, which constitutes the foremost cultural problem of our day and age, I think that Science has inadvertently contributed. There was a time, not very long ago, when Science, in the popular meaning of the word, bade fair to take the place

[1] J. Huizinga, *In the Shadow of Tomorrow* (Heinemann, 1935), pp. 64, 81.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 83 (Max Weber, Max Scheler, Karl Mannheim, Oswald Spengler).

of Religion in the veneration of the common man. Then it was revered as giving a new insight into truth and as extending the boundaries of human knowledge. But now that it has to a large extent become the handmaid of a commercialized technology while its higher reaches are inaccessible to the minds of any but the initiated few, it is cherished less for its educative value than for its capacity to raise the standard of our material comfort, like a wealthy uncle.[1] The modern man is no longer so interested as he was in The Mysterious Universe; when he speaks of the Marvels of Modern Science, he is thinking primarily of the kind of science that has bestowed upon us the wireless and the diesel engine and the Atlantic Clipper, of the kind of science that takes away from the African native his superstitious fetish and gives him in exchange an iodine locket. In consequence, the idea of scientific education, and with it the whole idea of education in its universal range, has tended to become material and commercial. Knowledge is Income, particularly when attested by a higher certificate or by a university degree. The love of knowledge for its own sake, the single-minded pursuit of truth, has become a luxury reserved for those who enjoy either private means or public subsidies or a few privileged academic posts. In consequence, Science as now circumstanced can do but little to protect us from the fatality of relativism.

What, then, will avail to do so? To-day the cry is all for Christian Education as the universal panacea for our social ills. There is, however, a strong suggestion that this Christian Education is desiderated less for its own sake than, rather, as a form of social insurance against the disfavour of the gods upon the one hand and against revolutionary disturbance on the other, which is substantially the rôle allotted to the State religion in Plato's *Laws*. But the essential premiss of successful Christian Education is the family as a worshipping unit; and, until this condition is satisfied, Christian Education must, in the vast majority of cases, remain a barren sciolism, without power to deliver us from the fatality of relativism; or, as an unscrupulous device for visiting the moral indolence of the parents upon the children, fiercely resented by its victims.

Meanwhile, presumably, we shall muddle on, with

[1] *Cf.* M. Maisky: "There is no place in the U.S.S.R. for pure science" (quoted in *Nature*, October 25, 1941, vol. cxlviii, p. 497).

emotions and aspirations continuing to do duty for principles and convictions; from whence arises that dislike of accepting personal responsibility which has been so notable a feature of our times. Of course, as we are wont complacently to observe, there is still plenty of simple goodness in our people. There is also a certain amount of simple badness, though this is not so often mentioned. But simple goodness is essentially pragmatical, inasmuch as it is not based on the deliberate acceptance of absolute supernatural truth: it is the line of least resistance, and as such it is conditioned by the pressure of social convention at any given time. A generation since, it gave you chastity; a generation hence, will it even give you kindliness? What is your "simple goodness" after all except a diminishing dividend of Christian ethics on a diminishing capital of Christian dogma? Well, it is something more than that; it is the reflection in the heart of the natural man of the supernatural radiance of the Light that lighteth every man coming into the world; yet that reflection may be and can be darkened. What guarantee does your social pragmatism offer you against a conception of justice as profoundly non-ethical as that in Plato's *Republic*, or as profoundly opportunist as that in Hitler's Reich? . . . The leaven of Herod is as corroding as it is pervasive.

It has become almost a platitude to observe that the later Victorians were wrong in thinking that you could retain Christian morality while discarding Christian doctrine, which is its intellectual foundation. To the heritage of hopeful thinking which they bequeathed to us, the remaking of the world by rationality, humanity, and moderation, has since been added the pathetic supposition that this would be more easily achieved when once we had emancipated ourselves from certain old-fashioned inhibitions about virtue and patriotism, from the convention of living with your wife and dying for your country. Add to this the sense of impermanence and insecurity and frustration, particularly, in this country, in the last five years immediately preceding the present renewal of hostilities, and it is not difficult to understand, as it is also impossible not to pity, the triviality and irresolution of the Western democratic culture in the valley of indecision. During the armistice of 1918-39, a decade of intellectual curiosity without serious thought had been superseded, under an unexpected economic pressure, by a decade of serious thought without intellectual

curiosity. Never was there so much talent or so little genius; never was there so much information or so little vision. The characteristic monument of this culture was the Book of the Month, with all the hideous implications of that phrase. *πάντα ῥεῖ.*

III

It would indeed be idle to pretend that the Christians were not to some extent infected by the prevailing temper of the age, notably in a rather specious exaltation of what was called " the spirit " as against what was called " the letter "; but at least their City had foundations, because it had not been built in the Waste Land nor by the will of the flesh. And one of the most interesting and significant reactions against the prevailing confusion of values, the irresponsibility and fatalism and indifference, the underlying incredulity in regard to any sort of absolute standards, was the steady trickle of intellectual conversions to Christianity, and particularly to Anglicanism. But it was not one of these new converts, but a layman born and bred in the Anglican tradition, who wrote in his autobiography, lately published: " I have been fortunate above all in an age of bewilderment and scepticism, I will not say in having kept the Faith, but rather in the tenacity with which the Faith has held on to me."[1]

Teneo et Teneor : I hold, and I am held. Amid all the changes and chances of this mortal life, amid the tyranny of the transient and the ephemeral, amid that terror of oblivion which makes men talk wildly of " eternal fame "[2] and of political systems built to endure for a thousand years[3]—forgetting that in the sight of God a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night (Ps. xc, 4, A.V.); amid all this, so strange and so familiar, still the eternal verities, God's revelation of His

[1] Maurice B. Reckitt, *As it Happened : An Autobiography* (Dent, 1941), p. 292.

[2] " I did not need this war to make my name eternal."—Adolf Hitler, speech at the opening of the Winter Relief Fund in Berlin, October 3, 1941 (*The Times*, October 4).

[3] *Cf.* the Führer's proclamation at Nuremberg, September 5, 1934 (*vide* William L. Shirer, *Berlin Diary*, p. 25), " The German form of life is definitely determined for the next thousand years "; *cf.* also, " We need not have any doubt that at this time the fate of Europe is being decided for the next thousand years " (Hitler, address to the Old Guard, Löwenbräu Keller, Munich, November 9, 1940, and *passim*).

purpose and of man's vocation, abide unchanging and unchanged. Christ builds His Church upon the rock of faith. The outlook may seem dark and difficult; we may appear to ourselves as ill prepared for peace as we were ill prepared for war. Yet "between the extremes of despairing pessimism and the belief in imminent deliverance stand all those who see the grave evils and shortcomings of our time, who do not know how they are to be remedied and overcome, but who hope and work, who strive to understand and are ready to bear,"[1] because they know in Whom they have believed. "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you" (1 Peter i, 24-5). "*Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod.*"

CHARLES SMYTH.

The Liturgical Tradition in English Verse: Herbert and Eliot

GEORGE HERBERT's poetry, in its crystalline fineness, might seem far removed from the convolutions of Mr Eliot's later verse. Yet there are enough similarities between them to make the remaining differences illuminating. A comparison of the two would show how in Mr Eliot a symbolic technique has been adapted to a less congenial age; Herbert's successes throw light on Eliot's difficulties and help to an understanding of what he has achieved.

Much of what Eliot says in contrasting Lancelot Andrewes with Donne would apply to George Herbert,[2] who is indeed the poetic equivalent of Andrewes. His material is dogmatic, his method the traditional one of symbolic exegesis. Herbert analysed and split up the Church building or the service, as Andrewes divided and subdivided his text,[3] and upon this fixed and literal basis each will freely play those variations suggested by his learned and intellectual interests, his natural and simple tastes, and his deep devotional fervour.

[1] Huizinga, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[2] T. S. Eliot, "Lancelot Andrewes", *Selected Essays*, Faber and Faber, 1932.

[3] For the medieval origins of the method, see B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1941).

Such a poem as *Trinitie Sunday*, though it uses verbal patterns as in *Easter Wings* or *The Altar*, appears thereby only more completely subdued to its subject; it is no *tour de force*, but a linguist's metamorphosis.

> Lord, who hast form'd me out of mud,
> And hast redeemed me through Thy blood,
> And sanctifi'd me to do good;
>
> Purge all my sins done heretofore;
> For I confess my heavie score
> And I will strive to sin no more.
>
> Enrich my heart, mouth, hands in me
> With faith, with hope, with charitie;
> That I may run, rise, rest with Thee.

In Herbert the strict emblematic code[1] concurs with an exact and scrupulous intention; formality emphasizes directness. "Lord, who hast form'd me *out of mud* . . ." the verse on the power of the First Person at once recalls Genesis, acts as a personal confession and sets up a blunt heavy rhythm symptomatic of the overtone of plodding effort:

> And I will strive to sin no more.

Unemotional compared with one of Donne's *Holy Sonnets*, this line draws its strength from its context, from being part of a system (*cp. Sinne's Round*, *A Wreath*). Herbert is one of the few English poets who relies upon liturgy not for its emotional effects, but for its power to concentrate dogma. The services, the building, the vestments are the themes of his verse, not because he was a ritualist, but because he was an intellectual, and it was the general truth, not the private experience, which came first with him. He had an academic training and a scholar's taste for intellectual symmetry; his besetting sin, as he was well aware, was intellectual pride and self-sufficiency,[2] and humility the virtue for which he most earnestly prayed.[3]

Such a mind was too critical for emotional excitement, too alert to accept vagueness, too finely tempered to be well at ease.[4] With all his impersonality, Herbert wrote some

[1] See R. Freeman, "George Herbert and the Emblem Books", *Review of English Studies*, April, 1941.

[2] *Affliction*, I; *Unkindness ; Submission ; The Collar.*

[3] *Humilitie ; Miserie ; The Posie.*

[4] Points which differentiate him from the ritualist poets of the nineteenth century, but link him to medieval lyric.

of the most exact and painful records of the *via negativa* in English (*Grace ; Praise I ; Home ; Longing*).

My bent thoughts like a brittle bow
Did fly asunder . . .

O that Thou should give dust a tongue
To crie to Thee !
And then not hear it crying ! all day long,
My heart was in my knee
But no hearing. (*Deniall.*)

O do not blinde me !
I have deserved that an Egyptian night
Should thicken all my powers: because my lust
Hath still sow'd figleaves to exclude Thy sight:
But I am frailty and already dust.
O do not grinde me ! (*Sighs and Grones.*)

My thoughts are all a case of knives
Wounding my heart
With scatter'd smart . . . (*Affliction, IV.*)

With sick, with famisht eyes
With doubling knees and weary bones,
To Thee my cries,
To Thee my grones,
To Thee my sighs, my tears ascend:
No end ?

Lord Jesu, Thou didst bow
Thy dying head upon the tree:
O be not now
More dead to me.
Lord, heare ! *Shall he that made the eare*
Not heare ? (*Longing.*)

Verses, ye are too fine a thing, too wise
For my rough sorrows: cease, be dumb and mute
Give up your feet and running to mine eyes
And keep your measures for some lover's lute,
Whose grief allows him musick and a rhyme:
For mine excludes both measure, tune and time:
Alas, my God ! (*Grief.*)

In all these verses there is a formal pattern which embodies the feeling; a short unrhymed line, to which Herbert is particularly given; or short rhyming lines at the beginning and end of the stanza which clip the verse off as if by scissors; or the direct address to his verses in *Grief*, which

recalls the addresses of Dante in his shorter pieces.[1] The technical " closeness " and the personal intensity focusing through an apparently too-artful medium is often reminiscent of the canzone, the ballade and the villanelle of the *dolce stil nuovo*. The impersonality of Herbert's statements justifies the controlled violence of his sensuous imagery. In *Sighs and Grones* the verbs stir up " Egyptian night ", so that the reference is not only to the ninth plague, but to all the sorcery and magic of the Nile; light " thickens ", as in *Macbeth*, with an uncanny agglutination. In *Grief* the adjectives of the first two lines quoted catch the fleeting " tone " of a state of mind and embody it as precisely as Herrick might have caught a physical sensation. The rough sorrows are coarse to the touch, rasping upon the tongue, broken to the ear. Yet they remain part of an argued, a systematized poem. If the argument is not one which could be restated syllogistically, it could not keep company with such powerful sensations and feelings except in a mind which had been trained to think syllogistically.

Herbert's failings are the failings of an intellectual. Sometimes he provides a peaceful province in acrostic land, a mistake rather than a lapse, an insufficient but not misdirected effort of thought and feeling. His second failing is the scholar's vice of idiosyncrasy. It is impossible to see why *Jordan* is called *Jordan*; the agility of his comparisons leaves the reader baffled, if he omits the intervening stages of thought. But his oddities remain verbally lucid. Even if we cannot read the map, it is clearly a map and not a scribble. If Herbert fails in communication, it is not because he is confused about what he wishes to communicate; he does not repel like Crashaw or embarrass like Donne in their weak moments. In his lack of emotion, Herbert, like Lancelot Andrewes, belongs temperamentally with the Victorines and Meister Eckhardt, who celebrated the virtue of detachment, rather than with the ecstasies of the great Spanish mystics. The perspicuity of Latin informs his richly idiomatic English as it did that of his contemporaries, Ben Jonson and Marvell. It is the best tribute to his Cambridge days that so rarefied a mind should have been tempered to the clarity of " the terrible crystal ". In Herbert may be seen a mind sensitive and controlled,

[1] Canzioniere iii, iv, v, vi, ix, x, xi, xii, xv, *ad fin.* ; *Vita Nuova*' xii, xix, xxxii, *ad fin.*

presenting the *vie intérieure* in terms of liturgy and ritual, recording the widest emotional reverberations in terms of almost pedantic formalism, and reconciling themes of perpetual struggle and self-conquest with a flawless precision, honesty, and grace of statement. It is of the nature of this achievement that its strength should be unobtrusive, and that a poetry which is simple, sensuous and passionate should be so only because complexity is resolved into unity and inner states embodied in familiar things.

The later poetry of T. S. Eliot, from *Ash Wednesday* to *The Dry Salvages*, shows certain persistent features together with a clear line of development. In these poems can be seen the attempt of another intellectual to record the *vie intérieure*, but in doing so faithfully to include such external reference as the subject demanded and to shirk nothing which personal or public circumstances might present as relevant. No one could accuse Eliot of quietism; the development from *Ash Wednesday* to *The Dry Salvages* is from a consideration of Christianity in relation to the self towards Christianity in relation both to the self and the modern world, including the present war.

The new sequence, of which *Burnt Norton*, *East Coker* and *The Dry Salvages* have appeared, was begun in 1935; but before that date the present situation had been anticipated in Eliot's poetry. A fourth poem will conclude this sequence (T.L.S., August 11, 1941).

The trend is endorsed by *After Strange Gods* (1934), which considers Christianity in relation to the artist, while *The Idea of a Christian Society* (1939) examines the more general situation.

In his first great poem, *The Waste Land* (1922), Eliot depicted the horror and disillusion of the post-war world, a world by no means fit for heroes to live in, and which in any case most of his friends did not survive to inhabit. It is dedicated to a Frenchman, " mort aux Dardenelles ". This shattered world appears in a series of broken and unrelated pictures, a technique which the cinema has made familiar, because only in this way could its disorder be embodied. The literary references which were at first considered such a stumbling-block are the artist's means for ordering this disorder; literature consoles and supports by reminding a distraught generation that it is not alone—in recognizing the right words for the present

situation, definition marks the first step to control; and accepting such a definition from a far-off place and time marks also the first step to integration. Eliot used the words of the *Inferno* to describe the crowd that " flowed up the hill and down King William Street ", because only a Dante could define for him his vision of their desolation. The poem accepts the personal suffering which such a vision entails; and the two utterances which give it most clearly are the cry from Arnaut Daniel and St Augustine on the drowned Phœnician sailor.[1] Each is a renunciation, and each had echoed through Eliot's poetry for some time. The lament for the Phœnician sailor gives the death of the natural man, but it is written with more tenderness and serenity than any other section of the poem, and in it lies the image of life as purgatory, the inverted spiral into which Phlebas goes down.

Eliot becomes more personal from *The Hollow Men* (1925) to *The Rock* (1934).

It is impossible to imagine how Herbert would have written had he lived to see the Civil War and its aftermath; but it was not until *Ash Wednesday* that Eliot attained that serenity and stability which Herbert maintained from the beginning. In *Ash Wednesday* Eliot is dealing with repentance and renunciation; with a *Purgatorio* rather than an *Inferno*. The lady who plays the part of Beatrice is present from the first, and the poem progresses from the *amour cortois* of Guido Cavalcanti, " Perch'io non speró di tornar giammai " through the purgatorial " staircase " of Section III—originally published as " Al som de l'escalina "—to the echo of Piccarda de Donati (*Paradiso*, III) in the final section, " Our peace in his will." It involves, as Eliot said in his essay on Dante, which forms also a valuable commentary on his own work at this time, " a renunciation greater than the renunciation at the grave, because a renunciation of feelings that persist beyond the grave "

[1] *Ara vos Prec* was the title of Eliot's first volume of poems, echoed in *Ash Wednesday*, iv; the original title of iii was " Al som de l'escalina ". The drowned Phœnician sailor first appeared with significant lack of comment in *Dans le Restaurant*, where he is ironically opposed to the " vieux lubrique " and is assuredly not " mon semblable, mon frère ". The significant transitions in this section of *The Waste Land*, from sensuous beauty (ll. 312-5) to death and its " whispers " (ll. 315-18), and to identification (ll. 319-21), make it, though the shortest, the main focal section of the poem—apart from its reflection of the dedication.

(*Selected Essays*, p. 269). The *via negativa* of Eliot at this stage is very like Herbert's; there are intervals of life:

> And now in age I bud again,
> After so many deaths I live and write.
> I once more smell the dew and rain. . . .
> (*The Flower.*)

> The desert in the garden, the garden in the desert
> Of drouth, spitting from the mouth the withered apple seed.
> (*Ash Wednesday, V.*)

But the emphasis is upon subduing self-will, and it is only after renunciation of natural beauty that such glimpses appear. The stage which is known to the mystic as dryness or the first dark night of the soul is here presented. In Section III the three stairs represent the three stages of Dante's *Purgatorio*; the purgation of defective and sluggish love, and of excessive love for created things:[1]

> Blown hair is sweet, brown hair over the mouth blown,
> Lilac and brown hair.
> Distraction, music of the flute, stops and steps of the mind over the third stair,
> Fading, fading: strength beyond hope and despair
> Climbing the third stair.

The flute is that of the garden god, Priapus, who is seen through " a slotted window bellied like the fig's fruit ".

The purgatorial fire which burns out the mental cravings by sheer pain of loss is not felt here, as in " The Fire Sermon ", Section V of *The Waste Land*; for at the beginning of *Ash Wednesday* the renunciation had been made:

> I rejoice that things are as they are and
> I renounce the blessed face
> And renounce the voice
> Because I cannot hope to turn again . . .
> (*Ash Wednesday, I.*)

[1] The motto for *Sweeney Agonistes* is the hard saying from St John of the Cross: " Hence the soul cannot be possessed of the divine union till it has divested itself of the love of created beings." Dante's version is:

> Ma, quando al mal si torce, o con più cura
> O con men che non dee corre nel bene,
> Contra il fattore adopra sua fattura.
> (*Purgatorio*, XVII, 100-2.)

The note of hardness and sheer assertion in these lines is softened in Section II, where the lady, through her honouring of the Virgin, helps to recover some sense of physical being from the dark night (" My guts, the strings of my eyes "), although the " dry bones " which are all that is left after the death of the natural man continue to sing, " We are glad to be scattered, we did little good to each other ", and to celebrate

> The Garden
> Where all love ends
> Terminate torment
> Of love unsatisfied,
> The greater torment
> Of love satisfied . . .

The relation of the lady to the " silent sister veiled in white and blue " who appears in the churchyard of Sections IV and V is that of the Beatrice of the *Purgatorio* to the Beatrice of the *Paradiso.*

But in Section V the naked will emerges in opposition to itself; it is sheer contest for submission,

> Pray for those who chose and oppose,

a contest which is only imperfectly resolved in Section VI, where the world beckons again,

> The lost heart stiffens and rejoices
> In the lost lilac and the lost sea voices . . .

to be overcome by an appeal to the lady which turns into an appeal to God (from Psalm cii):

> Sister, mother,
> And spirit of the river, spirit of the sea,
> Suffer me not to be separated,
>
> And let my cry come unto Thee.

Nevertheless, the natural world, which had been so richly and fully implicated in the earlier verse, *Sweeney and the Nightingales*, *La Figlia che Piange*, *Gerontion*, *The Waste Land*, seems already in this poem to be receding; the London of *The Waste Land* was as precisely felt as Baudelaire's Paris, but here the landscape is only a projection of a mental state; the garden and the desert are not to be found on any

map or imagined in any detail. The natural world returns only in Eliot's latest verse.

In this last section, too, are several echoes of the opening section, which, like themes repeated in a *finale*, show the development they have undergone; so that such lines as

> Teach us to care and not to care,
> Teach us to sit still

gain a new significance from the new context because of the endorsing power of the whole poem now behind them. This technical use of liturgical repetition Eliot shares with Herbert, the prosaic vocabulary controlled by a strong rhythm.

In other ways Herbert and Eliot are alike. *Ash Wednesday* is based directly upon the services, it quotes the Canon of the Mass, the Stations of the Cross, the Reproaches, and the scriptures. Its main reference is of course to Dante. In his essay Eliot described Dante as a poet who could help other writers—" safer to follow, even for us, than any English poet, including Shakespeare " (*Selected Essays*, p. 254). Dante provided Eliot with method and material, as the emblem writers did Herbert. Eliot also praises Dante for a quality we have already noted in Herbert, and which is revived, after a long lapse in English poetry, in Eliot's own work: the search for the objective correlative, " making us apprehend sensuously the various stages and states of blessedness. Thus the long oration of Beatrice about the will (Canto IV) is aimed at making us *feel* the condition of Piccarda. . . . Nowhere in poetry has experience so remote from ordinary experience been expressed so concretely, by a masterly use of that imagery of *light* which is the form of certain types of mystical experience " (*Selected Essays*, pp. 251-253).

It was not Herbert but his disciple Vaughan who was to develop this particular image:

> I saw Eternitie the other night,
> Like a great ring of pure and endless light. . . .

But it was Herbert who in such poems as *Love*, *The Pulley*, *Peace*, gave the fullest depth to the symbolic method; his use of symbols here does not essentially differ from the extended images in Dante—*e.g.*, the image of the just spirits in the figure of an eagle (*Paradiso*, XVIII-XX)—nor from Eliot's use of the desert, the traditional symbol of spiritual dryness,

which appears in *The Waste Land*, *The Hollow Men* and *Ash Wednesday*, though with different emphasis in each.[1]

Herbert, however, was using symbols which were generally understood in his time, and his method of using them was also familiar. Such a poem as *Love-Unknown* depends, as Miss Freeman has shown, upon a whole series of emblems upon the subject of the human heart, and the method of embodying the theme in *The Pulley* and *The Collar* where " the pulley is nowhere present in the substance of the poem; yet the title makes its whole point " shows that Herbert could make use of the habit as well as of the material offered. His liturgical-emblematic method was thus a means of conveying as well as of controlling his concepts.

Eliot has not such assistance. He used the fragments of European literature in *The Waste Land* only to render the collapse of European civilization. In approaching Dante, he had to battle against the prejudices of the age, to point out that the technique of the dream vision was the medieval equivalent of, *e.g.*, psychological terminology—that these apparently abstract and rhetorical patterns transmitted human experience.[2] He had also to battle with his own prejudices against the Ritualism of the Pre-Raphaelites, the discarded idols of his adolescent reading; and " the prejudice that poetry not only must be found *through* suffering, but can find its materials only *in* suffering. . . . It took me many years to realize that the states of improvement and beatitude which Dante describes are still further from what the modern world regards as cheerfulness than are his states of damnation " (*Selected Essays*, p. 248). Eliot had, however, a natural pictorial and symbolic bent, as

[1] *The Hollow Men* may be read as a prologue to *Ash Wednesday*. The Lady appears as " Eyes I dare not meet in dreams " (*cf.* Beatrice, " occhi santi ", *Purgatorio*, XXXI), as " the perpetual star, multifoliate rose "; but the main emphasis is still upon the dead land, where the souls of the dead " gather on the beach of the tumid river " (*Purgatorio*, II, 100-2). The different kingdoms of the dead (death's dream kingdom —*i.e.*, the present life; death's other kingdom—*i.e.*, life beyond the grave; and death's twilight kingdom, the region of sleep or intercommunication) are all equally grey and phantasmal.

[2] " The *Vita Nuova* is neither a ' confession ' nor an ' indiscretion ' in the modern sense, nor is it a piece of Pre-Raphaelite tapestry . . . the *Vita Nuova* can only be understood by accustoming oneself to find meanings in *final causes* rather than in origins . . . a very sound psychological treatise on something related to what is now called sublimation " (*Selected Essays*, pp. 259-261). The point of view has been fully developed in C. S. Lewis's *The Allegory of Love* (Oxford, 1936).

his early poems show; he had also a keen sense of what may be called its propaganda value in by-passing intellectual assent—" The advantage of a coherent traditional system of dogma and morals like the Catholic: it stands apart, for understanding and assent even without belief, from the single individual who propounds it " (*Selected Essays*, p. 244).

The difference between *The Hollow Men* and *Ash Wednesday* is the difference between unco-ordinated and co-ordinated symbol; hence *The Hollow Men* is more poignant but less impressive. It might be said that Eliot was still hesitating to " find meaning in final causes ", or, rather, the sting of immediate suffering prevented his doing so at that point. He was still perhaps obsessed by *The Golden Bough* and the difficulties of comparative religion. Such problems hardly existed in Herbert's world, in spite of the religious controversies which disfigured it; *The British Church* and *Church Rents and Schismes* are his only poems to deal with anything even remotely akin to such subjects.

In the poetry which followed *Ash Wednesday* Eliot develops the technique which he first practised in that poem and applies it to material so different as to recall *The Waste Land.* Whilst for Herbert, as a priest writing in a religious age, the devotional life was *ipso facto* a form of social life, for Eliot, a laic writing in an age of scepticism, such an identification is no longer possible. The problem is rather to maintain any sense of a connexion between public life and private devotion. Eliot achieves this by means of what he had learned in the Retreat of *Ash Wednesday*, but though in a sense his later poems derive from this poem, they are by that reason less comparable with Herbert's homogeneous work. The new qualities of Eliot's work may be summed up as an increasingly general and dramatic mode of presentation, with comprehensiveness rather than intensity as its aim. The themes are not new, but they become increasingly sharply defined as the problem of Time and Change *versus* Eternity and Grace. It is fitting, therefore, to leave this poetry for separate review.

M. C. Bradbrook.

God and History[1]

It has often been pointed out that among the most striking characteristics of the specifically Jewish and Christian type of theism is the conviction that God rules in history. For the prophets and seers of the Old Testament, called to set forth to their compatriots, often in menacing and dark times, the message or "word" of the Lord in relation to the events of their day, the conviction in question was the very foundation of their faith. However big with disaster might be the immediate future, however "charged with punishments the scroll", the assurance stands fast in the prophetic mind that the issues of history are in the hands of the God of all righteousness, who, as the drama of history unfolds, is accomplishing His "strange work" therein, though after a fashion which to the blinded vision of man may be for the time being inscrutable.

Yet the problem of history, with the religious interpretation of which the word of the Lord, uttered through prophecy, is in the Old Testament so largely concerned, pressed with increasing intensity, as the tragic centuries succeeded one another, on the anguished minds and hearts of the Jewish people. Apart from some periods of brief, relative and temporary prosperity, what an appalling record of suffering, oppression and tragedy their history presents! How painful the contrast between the actual lot of the Chosen People and the bright visions of a restored kingdom of David which from time to time gleam through the mists of prophecy, and which, like a delusive mirage for ever receding, yet hover perpetually upon the religious horizon, the ground and the basis still, for the devout Jew, of an unconquerable hope! There was, indeed, destined to be no literal fulfilment of the prophetic expectation. The dreams of a revived modern literalism, cherished in varying forms whether by Hebrew Zionists or by British Israelites, represent only a pathetic ploughing of barren sands. Yet if we claim (and as Christians we do claim) that there has been, and that there shall be, a fulfilment through Christ of the ultimate spiritual message and meaning of Hebrew prophecy as a true Word of God (not according to the letter but according

[1] This article and a sequel which will appear in next month's issue of Theology represent the substance of two sermons preached before the University of Oxford on successive Sundays in October, 1941.

to the spirit), it must needs be acknowledged how paradoxical in form, and how contrary to all merely human expectation, the fulfilment has been. " For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord."

The problem of history, meanwhile, which pressed so hardly upon the Jew, remains a problem for us still to-day. The Lord is still doing His " strange work " in history, and we, like the Israelites of old, would fain still be assured of the final triumph of the divine righteousness. Wishful thinking apart, can we have any adequate ground for such a hoped-for assurance? Is it, for example, a legitimate inference from our religious faith that in the present world struggle in which our country is engaged, and in which (as in all good conscience before God we are constrained to believe) it is against " evil things " that we are contending, the cause which we believe to be the cause of international righteousness must of necessity prevail? Can we, with spiritual certitude, rest secure in a kind of guaranteed confidence that, whatever the immediate sufferings and tragedies which may have to be endured, God, because He is righteous, must in due course, and at no distant date, vindicate righteousness by the carrying of the righteous cause to a decisive victory in the outward arena of world affairs?

Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht—so runs the proverb of our enemies. Is that proverb, with all that it seems to imply, to be accepted as true? And, if so, is the principle of world-judgment, as it is expressed and wrought out in history, in accordance with righteousness? " The victorious cause was approved by heaven ", says a Latin writer, " but the beaten cause by Cato "—with the implication, perhaps, that the judgment of Cato, the stern moralist, was to be preferred to that of the ethically indifferent gods.

The moralizing school of historians is not greatly in favour to-day. " The historian's business," we are told, " is with fact." He must make it his business, in the first place, to ascertain (in so far as it is possible to do so), and, having ascertained, to set forth, with objective impartiality, what actually happened—*was eigentlich geschehen ist.* It is his business, of course, to seek also to understand the facts, and in that sense to interpret them. But the interpretation, if it is to be a true interpretation, must grow out of the facts; it must not be read into them. It must be a setting forth

of their intrinsic and actual meaning. And the question is whether the facts of history, considered and interpreted thus objectively (more especially when attention is paid to their baffling complexity, to the immensities of their secular range, and to the fitful uncertainties of our partial and relative knowledge), can be said to be such as to lend themselves to interpretation in terms of any one simple criterion or category, still less to proclaim aloud, for the reassurance of anguished and tortured spirits, the comforting gospel of the continuous triumph and vindication of righteousness.

" I returned," wrote the ancient Hebrew philosopher, " and saw all the oppressions that are done under the sun: and behold, the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter. Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive; yea, better than both did I esteem him which hath not been, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun."

The author of the book known as Ecclesiastes is commonly accounted a pessimist. Let us listen to a modern historian. " After some twenty million years of life upon this planet," wrote the late Dr H. A. L. Fisher in the Epilogue to his *History of Europe*, " the lot of the major part of humanity is still, as Hobbes once described it, ' nasty, brutish, and short '. Of its two thousand million inhabitants some hundred and fifty million are still living very close to the hunger limit." Disclaiming concern with " all that human misery which prevails in the vast spaces of Asia, Africa and South America, where thousands of millions of men and women have lived, worked, and died, leaving no memorial, contributing nothing to the future ", he proceeds to summarize in retrospect his impressions of the history of Europe. Alas, the record, when all has been claimed that *can* be claimed for the achievements of civilization and culture, is to an appalling extent a long narrative of almost continuous wars and confusions, of lapses back into barbarism, of divisions and sufferings and calamity and international strife. The book ends, as it was inevitable that it should end, upon a note of at best dubious hope for the troubled future.

The horrors which at the present time are being perpetrated by the Japanese in China, as by the Germans in Poland and Russia and in how many other countries besides,

are abundantly paralleled in the shameful story of mankind. The tale of man's inhumanity to man, the record of sacked cities and ravaged populations, of torture and massacre and rapine and savage injustice and measureless cruelty, stretches back through the centuries of recorded time, and is descried dimly athwart the rise and fall of empires and civilizations, of which all that to-day remains may be a few mounded traces unearthed by the archæologist's spade. "One generation goeth and another generation cometh" (so wrote our old Hebrew philosopher), "but the earth abideth for ever." We know to-day that not even the latter statement is true; that there shall be an end in time, as there was a beginning in time, of the history of man on this planet, and of the planet itself; for the earth, and the planetary system, so far from abiding for ever, are (if we are to repose any confidence in the prognostications of physical science) destined one day to perish and to pass utterly away; or, at the least, no longer to support human life. A day will surely come when (in the words of the late Lord Balfour) "the energies of our system will decay, the glory of the sun will be dimmed, and the earth, tideless and inert, will no longer tolerate the race which for a moment disturbed its solitude. Man will go down into the pit, and all his thoughts will perish."

The philosophies of secularism are perpetually baffled by such reflections. They must needs issue in pessimism, precisely in proportion to the realism, and to the honesty of mind, with which the problems are faced. In the philosophies of secularism there is indeed no hope. There is hope to be found only in the recovery of the scriptural faith in the living God, the Creator and Lord of the universe, who is the Lord also of history.

All power, according to the scriptural view of things, comes from, and belongs to, God. Created beings, human or other (for the scriptures assume a belief in the existence and potency of both angels and demons), derive such power as belongs to them by concession and delegation from God; but the power of God remains absolute. And God, the eternal and absolute Lord, is at work in and through history, accomplishing His "strange work" therein, notwithstanding all such created wills as are opposed to Him. But the course of history, in which God is at work, and in which indeed (such is the emphatic faith of the scriptural writers) God takes sides, judging in righteousness, is not

self-interpreting. The ways of God are mysterious—"Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour." The judgments of God are by no means always immediately manifest: for there is "the hiding of his power"; and His full glory is not disclosed to the sons of men. If there had been moments in history in which, as the Hebrews believed, God's "holy arm" had been conspicuously "made bare", and in which He had "gotten himself the victory", there were periods also in which the ungodly appeared for the time being to triumph, and in which men "saw not their tokens", for there appeared to be "no prophet more". The reading of the record of history in terms of theistic faith could in no wise be said to be inevitable. There were "scoffers" or "scornful men", even in Israel; there were fools who said in their hearts "There is no God". Yet it is God still who reigns, and His judgments shall one day be made manifest openly.

If we look for the origins of this Hebrew faith in God's action in history, there is every reason to find them in the impression made by the events of a period to which the religious mind and the race-memory of the Hebrew people continually recurred—the events associated with the deliverance from Egypt, the "Sign" (as a recent writer has expressed it) "of the Red Sea", with its sequel in the theophany at Sinai and the giving of the Law. "The decisive action of God at the Red Sea" (I am quoting the same writer) "became for the Hebrews the determinative centre of their national existence, of their Passover worship, of their psalms and literature. . . . It was also the symbol of the hope of Israel: it carried the expectation of the 'prophet like unto Moses', and of the Messianic deliverance."[1] God, who had shown Himself to be the Lord of history by His mighty acts in the past, was the Lord of history still.

But that was an assurance, and a conclusion, of faith. It involved the reading of history in terms of the interpretation declared by the word of the Lord, as that word was uttered by prophecy. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing"—so runs the prophetic conviction—"but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." And the prophets were to a large extent prophets of evil, since evil was determined, and evil actually befell. The prophets

[1] Alan Richardson, *The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels*, p. 4.

(like Marshal Pétain) interpreted national calamity as being a punishment for national sins. It was for Israel, as for Vichy France, to submit patiently, and to kiss the rod. Nevertheless, it was involved in the faithfulness of Jehovah to His covenant that calamity and chastisement should not be the final word; the Lord would yet save Israel. It was a faith which, through centuries of suffering, maintained itself, notwithstanding its apparent contradiction and challenge by the course of events.

For the simple equation, implied in the message of the earlier of Israel's prophets, between suffering and merited chastisement for sin, as between prosperity and the favour of God, justly bestowed as the reward of righteousness, was not borne out by a maturer experience. The problem of suffering, alike in its national and in its individual aspects, was not in the long run found to be capable of so immediately obvious and facile a solution. The world in which man's lot is cast was discovered to be of a more tragic and complex character, and there were moments at which faith well-nigh failed.

Yet faith did not fail. "Though he slay me," exclaims the chief character in the Book of Job, "yet will I trust in him." The Book of Job, which is wholly concerned with the problem of suffering, raises the question whether there can be such a thing as disinterested goodness—"Doth Job serve God for naught?" Can faith survive, even when tried by an overwhelming and wholly unmerited spate of calamities? And the triumphant answer is "Yes". Elsewhere in the Old Testament—in the famous "servant" passages of the Second Isaiah—the vision is attained of the Martyr Nation (perhaps of the Martyr Individual), the Lord's innocent Servant, who bears the burden and chastisement of the sins of others, and who in the end sees of the travail of his soul, and is satisfied.

The developed and final faith of the Old Testament has travelled far from the primitive simplicities of the picture of Yahweh as a God of war, the inspirer of battle frenzy, who (though He demands indeed righteousness on the part of those who would serve Him) is yet first and foremost the champion in battle of the favoured people of His choice, and demands and enjoins a blood-feud with Amalek "from generation to generation". Wars indeed may persist, but with varying fortunes. It is a "strange work" which God does, and is doing, in history. There are no guaranteed

victories, either for Israel or for us. It may, indeed, be that " the Lord shall rise up as in Mount Perazim " and " shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon ". It may be (and our hearts lead us to hope for it) that, with the help of the Lord, the demonic forces of evil shall be overthrown, and there shall be (perhaps in the near future) a signal, if relative, victory of the forces of righteousness, even in the immediate and outward arena of this world's events.

But it is important to realize that religious faith does not *guarantee* such a victory. There may be reasonable grounds, based on industrial, political and military considerations, for the confident belief that in the end the war efforts of those whom we like to describe as the free peoples of the earth will be crowned with success. On such grounds we are justified in confronting the future with sober optimism, though we do well to be conscious that the end of strife (when the ending of strife is vouchsafed to us) will not be the end of our problems, and that the making of peace may be expected to be an even more formidable task than the making of war. What we may not and must not do is to assume, on the ground of our faith in God, that success in war can be guaranteed to us; for (as the late G. K. Chesterton once wrote) there is always the possibility that, if God be indeed present in a modern battle, He may be present " not as on Mount Gilboa, but as on Mount Calvary."

Calvary, we may remind ourselves, had for its sequel the Resurrection; and the Resurrection of Christ is the symbol of the eternal victory of God over evil, death and the grave. But that is a reflection which points forward to the conclusion that the ultimate clue to the meaning of history is not to be found within history itself; that the consummation of the divine purpose (which is the final fulfilment of history) is to be looked for not in this present world, but in a world, or in a sphere, which is beyond history—a world, or a sphere, which is beyond time, as it is beyond death, suffering, sorrow and tears.

The problem of God and history, in other words, is not to be solved upon the characteristically Old Testament level, for it is more than a this-world problem. It is not merely the case that, as a matter of actual psychology, man has (in the phrase of Shakespeare) " immortal longings " in him, and cries out in protest against the doom of ineluctable death. It is also the case that the interpretation of history in terms of a faith in the eternal righteousness of

God is not possible, unless faith (which alone can hope for a solution) has learnt to think in the terms of what has come to be called eschatology, and unless hope (to borrow and adapt a metaphor from the Epistle to the Hebrews) has learnt to anchor itself to moorings on the eternal and heavenly side of the veil between heaven and earth.

JOHN DERBY.

The *Great* Church

IT is becoming increasingly evident that the present parochial system of the Church of England is proving inadequate to bear the weight of the many tasks that have been laid upon it and the parochial clergy. Some advocate a ruthless root-and-branch reformation. Their proposals, though stimulating for purposes of discussion, are not likely to meet with any wide acceptance. Their radical nature must bring them into conflict with the inherited traditional feelings of those who would have to be organized into the new planning and also with the complicated vested interests of the present system. The *raison d'être* of most of these schemes is that the parish is regarded as the means to discharge certain functions in the religious life of the community; and because it is partially, at any rate, failing to do so, a new model of church organization is postulated that would appear more perfectly to provide these functions in the existing situation. We may grant that such schemes of total reconstruction may have their place if, through the pressure of outward circumstances or inner weakness, the parochial system should collapse. But this situation has not arisen. Parochial life may be sick, but it is not yet dead. In some places, notably new housing areas, it is surprisingly alive, though not necessarily contributing very much to the total impact of Christianity on the life of the community.

A living organism meets changed conditions and fresh environments by new growth from the existing structure and through the modification of its existing parts. What is needed is not the substitution of a new system, but the development of the parish life to meet the changed circumstances. The Anglican parochial system stands for a principle of great value, which in any reform to meet existing and perhaps only temporary circumstances cannot

be lightly abandoned—that of securing that every person in this country should be within the spiritual care and responsibility of some parish priest. It is an ideal often preserved more in the breach than the observance, as far as any real contact between priest and people is concerned. There are faults on both sides. In the great urban areas there is the crippling problem of sheer numbers so that the parochial clergy come to know and be known only to their congregations, many of whom live outside their parochial boundaries, and who in any case are a handful in comparison with the actual numbers living in the parochial area. Also a great number of parishes are dormitory areas of a shifting population which has no roots in the locality. In the past the family lived, and the wage-earner worked, if not in the parish of his residence, at least nearby. Whether it is due to this or to other causes, congregations (with exceptions) grow smaller and the church life becomes harder to maintain, and with the lack of numbers the parish as a social unit loses its power of attraction. It has to be realized that the parish problem cannot be separated from the total problem of the sociological breakdown and sectionalism of society, which presses most heavily on the urban proletariat. There are cases to-day where the Church has provided the necessary unifying force and remarkable results have been achieved, but it is dangerous and perhaps a subtle form of escapism to reason from particular successes without making a careful analysis of local circumstances and the human agencies concerned.

In the various discussions upon this subject certain points have become clear.

Thoughtful Church people are beginning to recognize that they are only a minority in a secular society and not the nation looked at from a religious point of view.

There is a growing sense of need in the secular body for a principle that will unify and co-ordinate its efforts towards a full life, together with a feeling that religion is the right and fitting instrument. There are towns, particularly in the North, where the old parish church or the great church of the town is closely bound up with the expression of civic life; but, taking the country by and large, these are the exceptions and not the rule. The parochial system seems to be inadequate to provide an answer. On the whole, the parish congregation is made up of those who value religion for its traditional stability and its emotional comfort rather

than for its dynamic effect in controlling and directing the circumstances of life.

It is also realized that, as an evangelistic body, the Church may need other and more specialized organs than the parish in order to make contact with those classes of the community which are most alive to intellectual and social problems. Hence it has been mooted that chaplaincies to works and business centres should be instituted and a revival of the guild system as regards religion might produce the necessary contact between the Church's ministrations and industry.

The new awareness of the situation is making demands upon the clergy that no one man can possibly meet, and raises acutely the question which must underlie all reform of organization, the training and most efficient use of the clergy. The parish priest has to be all things to all men for the sake of his congregation: " Every vicar must be a preacher, a teacher, a visitor, an organizer, good with men, with women, with young people, with children, something of a musician, something of a business man, in character firm but gentle, strong but tactful, able to handle the difficult members of his congregation, to lead the Church Council in paths of wisdom, to cheer the sick and warn the sinner, to be all things to all men, and yet to preserve his own self-respect, dignity and independence."[1] For the sake of his work as an evangelist, he must also be abreast of the problems that are occupying the minds of the non-Christians and sufficiently free from parochial duties to be able to provide the opportunities for meeting them and securing some measure of intercourse wherein he can get to know them and they to trust him. In his relationship with the secular community he must understand its political, economic and administrative problems. Likewise in the spiritual family of the faithful he, or at least some of his brethren, must have adequate training in moral and ascetic theology to meet the needs of the spiritual life which are of necessity particularly difficult in an age like the present wherein religious values are so often at variance with those current in the secular world. It is obviously impossible for one man to achieve all this. The task must be divided and a way must be found whereby the special gifts and knowledge of a number of clergy working together may be made available

[1] *Putting our House in Order*, p. 39.

for the service of the whole community. If the clergy must be grouped in order fully to discharge their ministrations, pastoral, prophetic and administrative, it may well be that the living way to develop the parochial life should be on somewhat the same lines.

So far the tendency has been, because of the financial difficulties, to unite adjacent parishes under one incumbent; but "experience has shown that single-handed town parishes do not normally make for efficiency, but equally it has shown that the union of two weak parishes in an urban area does not produce a strong one."[1] The alternative schemes seem to be either (1) a re-grouping which implies amalgamation of three, four or five parishes, or (2) the provision of certain central churches for specific and limited purposes alongside the existing parochial arrangements. Both schemes are somewhat of a sudden break with existing parochial conceptions.

(1) The former plan offers the immediate advantage of securing some measure of financial support through the pooling of the endowments and the sale of superfluous residences. It remains to be seen, however, whether the result, if no further financial support were forthcoming, would be sufficiently advantageous to counterbalance the disturbance caused by the rearrangement. The income of the combined parishes can provide little more man-power than it does at present and the needs of the existing congregations will continue, for whose sake the churches must be kept open, with the disadvantage of the lack of a resident pastor. In all probability the financial position will become worse, except for the endowment, as the congregational quotas might easily diminish through the laity's lack of understanding of and sympathy with this kind of scheme. The one solid advantage would seem to be a greater efficiency through central administration and the possibility of a division of labour amongst the clergy so as to secure the fullest use of their respective gifts. This is the ideal on paper. It is very doubtful if it would work out that way in practice because of the pressure of congregations to have their churches carried on as in the past, so that the most likely result would be a number of congregational churches, still weak units, staffed and controlled from a centre. It is true that the central church

[1] *Putting our House in Order*, p. 40.

might be able to initiate evangelistic and specialist activities which would have some effect on the whole area of the group, but unless new money is found or very advantageous sales of redundant residences have been secured the extra staffing or concentration of energy at the centre could only be secured to the detriment of the other congregational units.

(2) The second alternative, that of a Central Mission, envisages the continuance of the parish system as it is with the addition of a limited number of extra-parochial units devoted to evangelistic and specialized services for a wide district. Such a scheme necessitates the finding of new money or diverting existing sources of support into this channel. For instance, the quota could be used not to provide assistant clergy for the parishes, but could be used by the diocese to promote evangelistic centres under its own control, leaving the minimum number of parochial clergy to provide the bare necessities for the present congregations. It is obvious that a plan of this kind will evoke strong opposition, especially among the parochial clergy, for it will mean the weakening of the parishes for the sake of the questionable hope that a congregation can be built up round the central missions, and, even if the hope were realized, the congregation would tend to remain there. The Central Mission could only commend itself if it was formed by new money and if its sphere of operations was restricted to forming a catechumenate which would be handed on to the normal parochial life. With such limitations, where financial support is forthcoming, it might prove a valuable addition to the Church's ministrations.

However, the Central Mission plan, if it is to be introduced, should not be regarded as developing out of the parochial system, but as a special development of diocesan organization. Its planning and placing, its scope and reference, should be determined by the diocesan authorities on a long-term plan to meet the present secularization of life and the breakdown of the traditional pattern of society.

If the first alternative is no cure, but only the perpetuation of the present parochial weakness in another form, and if the second is a novel expedient which has little or no relation to the parochial system, it remains to be seen whether under pressure of present events the parochial system, at least in some localities, can give rise, without a break in continuity, to an organic development that will meet the present needs.

With this in mind, I would put forward a tentative plan which might be possible in some districts, where there is already a leading church in touch with the municipal and secular life, or where such a church could be made through the appointment of the right leader to secure the contact. Such a Great Church should not be thought of as a central mission, for the latter's work should be limited, while the Great Church should stand for the total Christian leadership of the locality.

The Church of Christ has a ministration to the whole man and the whole of society; it is both a select body and also the vivifying force to the world in which it stands as the witness to the Eternal Principles.

Religion has always provided a unifying sanction and explanation of the secular life, and, although many to-day look for this in the ministrations of the scientist, the social planner, the municipality and the school, there is still a strong feeling that religion has a necessary contribution, if not the most important, to make to the social structure of the new order which is coming into being. This may only be an interim phenomenon. If it is true that " Christianity must either baptize modern industrialized society or else it will be buried in it ",[1] then a strong and determined prophetic and evangelistic ministry to that society must be undertaken. The provision of Mayors' Sundays and the like whereby " different bodies come once a year and say their prayers "[2] may indeed make little mark on the daily life of society. Yet such services are a valuable contact, and it is doubtful whether very much more can be done within the present parochial system.

We have to be clear in distinguishing between the natural and the Christian. In a secular situation in which the Christians are a relatively small minority, it may be their duty to serve the secular order in such ways as it can understand and to keep alive at least the natural virtues and sense of community which is proper to man as man.

The Christian has a duty in the secular order of which he is a member, to preserve its life and to promote true secular living. There is a large field of work in which the religious influence should be felt, connected with relief, unemployment, housing, conditions of labour and industry, the life

[1] Vidler, *God's Judgment on Europe*, p. 62.
[2] *Putting our House in Order*, p. 45 .

of the people as men and women, which requires a specialist training and is best carried out in an area coterminous with the appropriate local authority. These needs point to the desirability of there being in each municipal area at least one church which is given an outstanding position and a staff sufficient to minister to these natural needs of society as society.

In those communities where the pattern of municipal life includes the old Parish or the Great Church, its incumbent is the natural link between the Church and the secular world. The aim of such ministrations is not directly to promote conversions, but to preserve the secular life from further disintegration.

In the same way the Church has a ministration to the secular life, national and municipal, in its political and economic activities through a ministry which is not evangelistic—*i.e.*, to leaven the situation with the pronouncement of the truth about things as they are seen from the Christian standpoint. Together with this must go the intelligent apologetic which must prove to society that " unless the Lord keep the city the watchman waketh but in vain ". This will not be accomplished by the repetition of traditional shibboleths, but only in the light of a complete theology expressed in terms that can be understood by the contemporary mental outlook. This is the first preliminary to the baptizing of modern society, for only by such action can it be converted.

In contrast to the prophetic emphasis, and the teaching about the true end of man and society in God, the evangelistic ministry must be directed to individuals, for a Christian society requires for its formation an instructed Christian élite.

A major difficulty to-day arises from the fact that the outlook of a large proportion of the Christian minority is not directed to contemporary realities, and so preaching and teaching, that are closely related thereto, alienate or confuse many of those who attend church regularly.

The average Christian congregation is not accustomed to this approach, and finds it disturbing and unhelpful to the maintenance and practice of its devotional life. This kind of preaching will therefore have more scope in those places where there is a deliberate attempt to catch the attention of the occasional visitor and inquirer. The same applies to the evangelistic task of the Church in the " public

proclamation of Christianity to the non-Christian world ". The regular congregation does not require continuous evangelism, nor are its services suitable for the purpose. It is important that we should realize the distinction brought out by Dodd between the proclamation and the exhortation, which latter is " the more or less informal discussion of various aspects of Christian life and thought, addressed to a congregation already established in the faith ".[2]

So far there has been little attempt to distinguish these three operations, prophecy, proclamation and exhortation, with the result that the trumpet gives an uncertain sound.

The complaint that the secular contact of the Church so often goes no farther than Mayors' Sundays and the like arises from the feeling that the Church's duty is to proclaim the Gospel and so to baptize society into a Christian community. The attempt to do so is often ineffective because the result is neither prophecy nor proclamation. In reality there is a place for both, but to be effective they must be distinguished; for the one is a preparation for the Gospel and is concerned with natural law. Until that is perceived, there is little or no foundation for the second, which is the message of redemption.

If it is desirable that there should be one municipal " prophesying " church, it is also desirable that there should be one " proclaiming " church. As the prophecy and the proclamation are related, for both are ministrations to the outsiders, the same centre should serve them both.

The establishment in each district of a Central or Great Parish Church would not be a break with the parochial past, but only a modification or development of the existing system. The old parishes would go on without being absorbed or interfered with, and the new work would be in the framework of the leading parish, which, because of its position and contact with the municipality, would in any case have the ministration to the outsiders over the whole district.

Such a Great Church might be envisaged as being the municipal church, the tribune for prophecy, the mission for evangelism, and the administrative centre for all the specialized activities needed to-day and which no one

[1] Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, p. 4.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

clergyman can possibly provide. It follows that it should have a large staff and would be the most suitable place for training the deacons and the junior clergy. To fulfil its functions adequately it should possess a more efficient material plant than most parishes have at their disposal.

There must be accommodation for the large staff, halls, classrooms, and meeting-places within a reasonable distance of the church. The ideal is that the whole should form one block, but that would only be possible where rebuilding has become necessary and there is sufficient space available to make it possible. I mention this because in bombed areas such a new start might be possible.

In determining the nature of the plant it is convenient to pass in review the kind of activities at which such a Great Church should be aiming. It must continue or form a congregation of a special type because it is the Great Church drawn from the whole district. This means it must provide the traditional type of services as well carried out as possible and maintain a high standard of traditional preaching as well as a thorough administration and care of its own parochial area. As the Great Church in touch with the municipality, it must continue or establish a relation between its services and the secular society in two ways. One the linking up, as has been done to-day in many places, of the secular life with the existing religious tradition, through Mayors' Sundays and the like, and, secondly, through the prophetic ministry of special services, preaching and lectures. It is essential that the first should be carried out in the church and with the congregation, but the second, if it is to be adequately performed, needs a supplementary building. In practice, unless the parochial services are to be displaced or inconvenient times adopted, the special services must be held outside the parish church. The link between the two which is vitally important will be secured by the personality of the clergy and the centralized administration.

It should be the function of the Great Church to forward the education of the Christian community and strengthen its devotional life. It should be responsible for the special services of the various Church societies, it could arrange meetings for Sunday-school teachers, special courses of instructions and, if it should have a hall fitted for cinematograph, provide illustrated lectures for biblical and missionary background. It could also provide classes for

senior Sunday-school attendants on Sundays and for adults and adolescents on weekdays which the weak parishes would find it difficult to staff.

It should provide Quiet Days, Open Retreats, Schools of Prayer and Religion, both at its own centre and in other places as requested. One at least of the members of the staff should be a trained retreat conductor and an ascetic theologian with a competent knowledge of modern psychology, and who, as well as dealing with people coming to the centre, can act as an adviser to the clergy in special cases when called upon.

The evangelistic work must depend to a certain degree upon the district. An essential principle of the proclamation of the Gospel is that people must be met where they are both in thought and living, otherwise it can make no contact. There can be no one method in a time like this when society is breaking down, when the various levels of society are so divided in their outlook and interests, and when there is no common understanding of the meaning of God, life and man.

The main groups in society are struggling each for their own political and economic security, and religion is unable to provide a unifying and rational idea for any one of them. In fact, there is a danger within the one Church of there being two religions preached, one of conservation and the other of progress. Apart from this, the difficulties of vocabulary and outlook on life of the intelligentsia, the middle-class bourgeoisie and the industrialized proletariat, are all different, and within the several groups they themselves are divided through ideological conflicts. Nothing will be accepted on authority, everything must be argued out. Discussion, or what in the Acts of the Apostles is called " disputing ", must play a large part in modern evangelism. For this purpose meetings must be arranged in halls, and trained leaders and teachers be provided who will also deal with the individual work which should follow the more general meetings.

In every group within society there is a proportion of disturbed and worried individuals who would be glad to find some place for religion in their lives, or at least to find out what religion has to offer. No doubt this is less pronounced in working-class areas, but the provision of meetings and of the simplest type of service in which the teaching and expression are closely related to their lives may be able

to secure some response. But it is among the better educated that the greatest promise for evangelism exists. It will be by understanding the difficulties of these disturbed people and from a knowledge of their background and what they are reading and experiencing that the evangelist will have to plan his approach. The one thing that is clear is that the ordinary parish services are not suitable for them until they have been converted and instructed. The advantage of connecting this work closely with the existing work of the Great Church is that, although it may be advisable to have services in separate buildings, it will be within the same organization, and the missioner will be on the staff of the Great Parish.

It would need a separate article to depict the " utopian layout " of such a Central Church where it could be constructed from the beginning. An East End rural dean and myself once spent a not too unprofitable afternoon in such an airy construction, devising the ideal plan—the church, the church hall, the classrooms and meeting-rooms, the library, the clergy house and the lay worker's house, and the cloister binding it all together in a kind of spiritual island in the waste of mean streets. An ideal dream, no doubt, but it at least showed us the many necessities which should and could be provided for in a strong and aggressive centre of Christian influence. The whole point of this article is to suggest that such a plan could be developed from the organic parish life of the present with additions to and modifications of the existing material.

There is, however, one point which should be dealt with in conclusion, and that is the future of the other parishes. In so far as they can maintain their congregational life they are fulfilling their purpose, and indirectly the Great Church should be feeding their congregations through the new converts and the return of the lapsed. Where, however, a parish church falls to such a level of congregational attendance that it is unable to keep itself going as an effective part of the local church life, it could be temporarily attached, by arrangement with the patrons, to the Great Church as a mission district till such time as a congregation could be built up again. This might save the suppression or amalgamation of parishes which are, for the time being, a burden on the existing ecclesiastical organization and no commendation of religion. The closing down, even the amalgamation, of parishes in the

face of the hope of a return to religion would seem to be a policy of unnecessary despair.

In venturing to put forward this scheme of the Great Parish, I do not want to be misunderstood. There is a tendency for some people to regard any proposal as being in the nature of a panacea that will solve all problems and also be of universal application. I have far too wide an experience of the local differences in urban areas, and between town and country, to think for a moment that any one scheme could solve present-day problems of parochial life. It must also be apparent that the key to such a plan is " personnel ". It is a problem as to whether the clergy who could do the many things required are available. I am myself more hopeful than a correspondent whose criticism, nevertheless, should receive notice; if it is even partially true, it points to the necessity of reform beginning in the heart and understanding before it can be implemented in the reorganization of institutions.

The Church of England does not possess the personnel capable of occupying more than a very few such " Great Churches ". There is as yet nothing in the training for the ministry which envisages the parson's job as essentially different from and much more difficult than that of the parson in the fifteenth, seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, all of which in comparison to our own were ages of faith. The instability of those ages where it existed was the instability of growing pains and not yet of chronic disease. But to-day we face a wholly different task. From contact with many clergy I must say it seems to me that only about 1 per cent. have the remotest idea what anyone is thinking outside the inner circle of the devout. But unless we clergy experience a most radical conversion the reaction to the establishment of such churches will, I'm afraid, be non-co-operative jealousy or a resigned bitterness, because the ordinary parish church will never be able to hold its younger and more vigorous people against the attraction of the Great Church. The congregations in our churches are largely out of touch with and ignoring realities and would resent any serious attempt to present the Gospel along any lines unfamiliar to their own devotional practice. Moreover, the financial support of the church comes from the minority of people who still go to church because church as it is still meets their needs. The fact that in numbers they are dwindling rapidly away doesn't worry most of them one tiny scrap.

My friend's view may be felt to be an overstatement, but the fact that it can be made, in my opinion, strengthens the

case for the setting up of the Great Church. I would emphasize again that the possibility of such great parishes is naturally restricted to suitable localities, for it postulates an existent church which has something of a position and a sufficient number of nearby parishes through which it can exercise its beneficent influence. In some places the cathedral might fill the rôle. I should be sorry to think that clerical jealousies, shortsighted patrons, or obstructionist laity would make such healthy collaboration impossible—at least, I hope for better things of my brethren.

GILBERT SHAW.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

CHATTO AND WINDUS: Aldous Huxley, *Grey Eminence* (15s.).

DACRE PRESS: Joseph Barker, C.R., *Sacrificial Priesthood* (1s. 6d.); *Intercommunion* (4d.).

FABER: *The Church Looks Ahead*—Broadcast talks (3s. 6d.).

FORTUNE PRESS: Nicholas Moore, *A Wish in Season*; John Waller, *Fortunate Hamlet*; Robert Cecil, *Levant and Other Poems*; Glyn Jones, *Poems*; Leonard Clark, *Poems*; Tambimuttu, *Out of this War* (4s. 6d. each).

HODGES AND FIGGIS: J. E. L. Oulton, *The Study of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin* (6d.).

METHUEN: E. H. Fellowes, *English Cathedral Music* (16s.).

MOWBRAYS: F. Biggart, C.R., *As a Thief in the Night* (2s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. Milner-White and G. W. Briggs, *Daily Prayer* (5s.); S. Kierkegaard, *Stages on Life's Way* (30s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: S. Leeson, *A Study of the Gospel of Christ* (5s.); H. E. Fosdick, *Living under Tension* (7s. 6d.); J. C. Bennett, *Christian Realism* (6s.).

SECKER AND WARBURG: Bernard Causton, *The Moral Blitz* (2s.).

S.P.C.K.: M. Bruce, *Prayers in Time of Strife* (1s.); *Bishop G. L. King, The Man and His Message* (2s. 6d.); B. J. Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church*, Vol. III, 500-1500 (7s. 6d.); P. E. P., *Church Reform* (1s.).

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Charles Smyth is Fellow and Dean of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Hon. Canon of Derby.

Miss Bradbrook is a Fellow of Girton College, Cambridge, and Lecturer in English Literature.

The Rev. Gilbert Shaw was Organizing Secretary of the Association for Promoting Retreats from 1928 to 1932, and subsequently worked in the East End of London.

The Rev. L. J. Collins, Fellow and Dean of Oriel College, Oxford, is serving as a Chaplain in the R.A.F.V.R.

The Rev. J. E. Yates, B.D., is Assistant Curate of St James's Church, Birch-in-Rusholme, Manchester.

The Rev. W. J. Brown, B.D., is Vicar of Dewsbury and Canon of Wakefield.

REVISED REVIEWS—XI

The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. By Burnett Hillman Streeter. Macmillan. 1924.

I propose to review a book which must be familiar to the majority of readers of Theology. *The Four Gospels* has, for the last seventeen years, played a prominent part in informing and influencing the minds of English theological students and ministers of religion. Familiarity sometimes breeds contempt and sometimes intolerable loyalty and blind discipleship. So it is with this handbook; some can say little or nothing in its favour, and some take it to be the golden key to open the way to a solution of all problems connected with the Synoptic Gospels. This review, I hope, may help towards the making of a just evaluation of it.

In the Introduction Canon Streeter set out quite clearly his terms of reference and his aim: " Students in various specialized branches of research such as textual criticism, source-analysis, the cultural background of the early Church and the psychology of Mysticism have worked at these subjects more or less in isolation. . . . But the time is ripe for an attempt to co-ordinate the results reached—so far as they bear on the origin of the Gospels—and see them in their true relation in a *single organic process of historical evolution* [italics my own]. In this volume I have set out some researches of my own . . . ; but my main aim has been that co-ordination of the results achieved along different lines of investigation which, by using these to illuminate and consolidate one another, provides a basis for further conclusions." Further, he had three types of reader in view: (1) The interested and educated layman prepared to do a piece of solid reading, but not possessed of any previous technical

knowledge. (2) The divinity student or minister of religion who wants an up-to-date introduction to textual criticism, the synoptic problem and the Johannine question. (3) The expert New Testament scholar to whom are submitted for judgment the results of his own original research. It is recommended that Chapters III-VI, VIII-XII, and XIV should be omitted by a reader to whom the whole subject is new.

With the first and second classes of reader in view, the layout of the book is excellent. A clear outline of the argument is given in a synopsis at the head of each chapter; the style of writing is good; matter with which a beginner can afford to dispense is relegated to footnotes; and the reader who is unacquainted with Greek is given consideration. After an introductory chapter, the book is divided into four parts: (1) The Manuscript Tradition, Chapters II-VI; (2) The Synoptic Problem, Chapters VII-XII; (3) The Fourth Gospel, Chapters XIII-XVI; (4) Synoptic Origins, Chapters XVII-XVIII. There follow four appendixes concerned with Part 1, and useful indexes of MSS, Subjects, Proper Names, and Scripture References.

Part 1.—Chapters II and III are a valuable introduction to the study of textual matters, and they present a case for the theory of local texts associated with the great sees of the early Church. They abound with sound common sense and they give the reader some guiding principles in assessing the worth of variant readings.

In the next three chapters Streeter states and expounds the results of his researches in the field of textual criticism. His main object is to justify the identification he makes of the text found in fam. Θ with the text in use at Cæsarea about A.D. 230. This identification he believes to be the most original and far-reaching of his conclusions about the text of the Gospels and the "coping stone of the arch in that reconstruction of the various local texts of the Gospels current in the early Church at which scholars have been working for a generation". I think that, on the whole, a good case is made out for the identification fam. θ = Cæsarea and also for Coptic, B, ℵ, etc.=Alexandria, and Old Latin=Rome; but I am less sure about the case for Old Syriac=Antioch; and the attempt to identify D type texts with Ephesus is not at all convincing.[1]

Part 2.—Chapter VII deals admirably with the fundamental solution of the synoptic problem, the priority of Mark. The exploding of the Ur-Marcus theory (excellently effected) is used as a basis for discussion and explanation of omissions from Mark in Matthew and Luke and of minor agreements in Matthew and Luke against Mark—these agreements, Streeter argues, lead

[1] See pp. 70-75. Particularly doubtful is the double use made of Tatian, first on page 71 and later on page 74.

more probably to the conclusion that our text of Mark is more primitive than that used by Matthew and Luke.

Chapter VIII argues for the Proto-Luke hypothesis. Streeter was a master at moving to a conclusion already arrived at by intelligent guesswork. But here the argument is somewhat thin. At the chief point of testing the theory, in Luke's Passion Story, there is an admission that " the disentanglement of the elements derived from Mark and from Proto-Luke respectively . . . is in points of detail highly speculative "—this is an understatement. And this admission is followed by the statement, " if the general position that Luke preferred Proto-Luke to Mark is correct, we are entitled to approach the question with the preliminary assumption that everything after Luke xxii, 14 is derived from Proto-Luke, except those verses which there are special reasons for assigning to Mark ". But, if the Passion Story in Luke is not mainly derived from Proto-Luke, the chief grounds for supposing that Luke prefers this supposed source are gone !

Chapter IX is a well-sustained defence of the four-document theory. And in Chapter X the attempted reconstruction of Q is highly speculative—more so, I think, than Streeter supposed. In Chapter XI we get a clear indication of the author's real interest in this book. At the conclusion (pp. 329-331) of a consideration of the minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, he ends with the words: " Renounce once and for all the chase of the phantom Ur-Marcus, and the study of minor agreements becomes the highway to the recovery of the purest text of the Gospels."

The treatment of the problem of the lost ending of Mark, in Chapter XII, is particularly illuminating in showing us the mind of Streeter. For he never once stops to consider the possibility that there is no lost ending, the Gospel having originally ended at xvi, 8.

Part 3.—This section is, I think, the least valuable part of the book. Streeter's method of approach to Gospel problems is not suited to a satisfactory treatment of the Fourth Gospel. The presupposition that John's theology is undominical and a later ecclesiastical development out of a more primitive theology of the Synoptic Gospels vitiates the argument throughout; and so much of what is said is too speculative to be of much value. Nevertheless, there are some interesting suggestions and guesses made; and particularly useful is the weighty attack launched against " partition theories ". In Chapter XIII the question of the relationship between fact and symbol or interpretation is introduced; but we are not carried very far along this important road, nor does the author seem to be aware of its vital significance for a student of the Fourth Gospel.

Part 4 is a useful survey and discussion of critical problems of date, authorship and provenance of the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

That *The Four Gospels* is fully worthy of serious consideration by English New Testament students and scholars should be evident. It achieves to a large extent what was Canon Streeter's main object in writing it—namely, to co-ordinate the results of past and contemporary work on the Gospels and to present them in a single organic process of historical evolution. And the original contributions, particularly in regard to textual matters, call for attention from expert New Testament scholars. But, having regard to the important place this book occupies in the training of men for the ministry, it is well to note some of its more serious shortcomings.

In the first place, we should look carefully at that sinister phrase, *a single organic process of historical evolution.* It is the sign of the cloven hoof. Throughout the book Streeter is controlled by his adherence to a nineteenth-century Liberal Protestant philosophy of history, and the problem of the meaning of history in relation to the Gospels is not faced. Inspired by Darwinism, and believing in a natural progress in thought and practice along a line of development from the little to the great, he supposes that Christian theology developed in the same manner. On page 425 we read: " . . . Mark, Luke and John form a progressive series the characteristic direction of which is a tendency to make more and more of the idea of Christianity as the universal religion. . . . The Fourth Gospel is thus the climax reached in the development of theology in the New Testament towards the naturalization of Christianity in the Hellenic world." And critical problems are treated as though it were scientific to disregard theology when dealing with literary and textual matters; the point of view is rather to interpret the Gospels into a preconceived plan of what the writers must have meant than to let them speak for themselves, even though, in doing so, the preconceived plan must be thrown overboard. But Streeter belonged to his own generation; and it is unfair to criticize him for this except in order to warn present-day readers of his book of one of its major pitfalls.

Secondly, I wish to draw attention to weaknesses in the book itself. There are two such for which I see no reasonable excuse. First, there is evident a certain slickness in getting over obstacles to some of the theories put forward by the author—a good example of this may be found on page 57. The incautious beginner may be tempted to accept too readily theories put forward by him and to suppose, on insufficient grounds, that certain statements are commonly held to be true. Secondly, we find in the book no mention of the works of Loisy, Goguel, Wrede, Bultmann and Dibelius—to name only a few of those New Testament scholars to whom we should expect to find reference. It is a serious defect on the part of one who claims to co-ordinate " the results achieved along different lines of investigation " to have failed entirely to reckon with Form-

criticism. In German theological circles the work of Wrede had, long before this book was written, already set scholars busy on applying the methods of Form-criticism to the Gospels. And Bultmann published in 1921 his book *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, and Dibelius in 1919 his *Formgeschichte des Evangelien*. I wish to make no other comment than to recall that *The Four Gospels* was published in 1924.

L. J. Collins.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you.—Matt. v, 44.

Dr A. T. Cadoux asserts that the passage, verses 43-48, containing this verse means we are " to be in act what we are in essence " (sons of God), and that " divine Sonship is not a status to be gained but a truth to be realized ".[1] Something of this kind is assumed by the argument of the passage, but its real point concerns the *nature* of sonship, as expressed in its relation to other men. This is based on God's Neighbourliness or Providence: first, as the Archetype of any true sonship; secondly, as the Providence which alone makes the appropriation of sonship possible; thirdly, as the Living Rule from which, and in communion with which, the sons gain their essence and keep it.

Thus, God does not favour the righteous farmer (ver. 45), He gives each worker a penny (Matt. xx, 1 *ff.*), sows His seed over the whole field (Mark iv, 3 *ff.*), treats men as His sons, not as His hired servants. This Rule of God is always operative in His world, but is now appearing in man's private preserve, the field of human relations, in the person of Jesus and those " with Him ". Thereupon tension and friction arise between these and the human segregations based on false or imperfect " measures " of love and neighbourliness. This passage is an illuminating comment on the second Great Command: " love " is possibly an Aramaism, used in contrast to " hate ", but here is clearly carried over from ver. 43, extending the neighbour of Lev. xix, 18 to cover enemies, persecutors, Samaritans and Gentiles. What " love " means for Jesus is indicated by the locus which it traces out—the neighbour God loves as Himself. Clearly, our text refers primarily to the enemies of Jesus and His apprentices, just as its substance can only apply properly to those who are " with Him ", in process of becoming sons of God. Torrey's translation of " perfect " in ver. 48 as " all-embracing ", made on independent grounds. points the argument of the whole passage.[2] This all-embracingness is not a vague idealism, imposed

[1] *The Theology of Jesus*, p. 76.

[2] *The Four Gospels : A New Translation* (see note on Matt. v, 48).

from without upon men, but something from within, based on their status before God; it is *generically* universal, its proper focus being given in the story of the Good Samaritan (Luke x, 25 to end). It invades every form of personal relation, including those we imagine we have "broken off". But first it must be set up in men themselves.

To this end God has designed His world; men are treated as sons. If they do not respond, the facilities which God offers them, which make regeneration and growth still possible, become their undoing. Forgiveness and judgment both proceed from God's persistence in loving His enemies. We cannot stand still in God's world; if we try to, we lose what we had (Mark iv, 25). On the other hand, if we measure what we have, spend our life for His sake, we find it (Mark iv, 24, viii, 35), because He returns interest on our spending and makes regeneration and growth possible. This saves the Golden Rule from sterile formality. Again, as we begin to find our true selves, we begin to find our responsibilities to others—"From him to whom much is given, much is expected." The text we are studying is to be understood in this light. When there is fellowship, the "love" may take the form of a stern rebuke, like that to Peter. Penitence may be evoked, opening the flood-gates of forgiveness; but that renewal of relation is only possible because of "love for enemies" and the active co-operation with God's Providence it implies. (In Peter's case this was probably the Crucifixion itself.) The doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sin is therefore secondary to this all-embracing Providence of God from which it proceeds, although this is, naturally, cast in the form of forgiveness in the Fellowship Prayer prescribed for Jesus' apprentices. Forgivingness on their part implies that they are beginning, however feebly, to work with God and are able, in that measure, to profit by His forgiving Providence. But if they are not forgiving, the Providence will still be there — and they are not likely to think it forgiving. God's love is rarely pleasing to the sinner. Even so, God in His wisdom can save men from dangers they hardly suspect to exist, even though they will not let Him give them all He wishes to bestow. Men are in greater danger even than that which the woeful state of human society suggests, just because they are intended to be sons of God and live in a world designed to that end. Thus, an Elder Son, who is yet no son, is in danger of "outer darkness"; the Father's courteous exhortation as to what is "meet" is, significantly, the end of the story (Luke xv, 31 *f.*). He may, or may not, gain his son.

The active enemy is a simpler case in one respect, since he breaks off direct relations; the aggressive relation he does offer is seized upon and made to serve God's Providence. The natural reaction of God's sons is to interpret such acts according to God's mind (cp. Habakkuk i, 13). Jesus' controversial

method is one example; others are given in Matt. v, 37-42, where what is called " non-retaliation " is really a very active spiritual ju-jitsu, keeping open some form of relation by turning the situation into something it was not intended to be. Just as much as in the casting out of demons, this activity manifests the Kingly Rule of God. The measure the enemy measures is returned, with " interest ", by God's fellow-workers, who do the best they can with the material offered. That is their job, for which they receive " thanks " (cp. Luke vi, 27-38). They " give out of their own store "—*i.e.*, their actions are informed by love, not hate. Their purpose is to recreate the situation rather than to impress the aggressor. " Agree with thine adversary quickly, while you are in the way with him." In the limiting case, Jesus' use of the Cross, it may clearly be seen that this supremely intelligent activity, or providential tact, is only possible by working abreast of God, in prayer; it is a gift which has to be won afresh continually, as each stage of growth creates further responsibilities (Mark xiv, 32 *ff.*). Thus the tension, staved off by Jesus' masterly " love for His enemies ", reaches snapping point at Gethsemane. He shrinks from accepting the fate the Jews offer Him, a fate evoked from them by His nature as Son of God, because His final rejection would make God's love the occasion of Israel's rejection. Thus, unlike Paul (Rom. xii, 19 *f.*), the great Lover puts the " coals of fire " on His own head; when they burn on the heads of His enemies it is because they have become His friends. He takes the carnival of evil to Himself and makes it speak the language of God.

Men have always found God's forgiving righteousness in the Passion of Jesus; yet the Apostles' vivid sense of impending judgment was, in substance, correct; for the Kingdom was taken from Israel, as it will be taken from other nations not bringing forth the fruits thereof. Love for enemies is neither a blind sentiment nor a seeking of martyrdom, but the active translation of God's Providence into terms of human life. It aims at keeping the account open, not at closing it; from this we may understand something of Jesus' agony in Gethsemane and of the redemptive nature of God's Providence in incarnate form. That in itself is sufficient to warn us against superficial interpretations of this teaching—*e.g.*, as a social policy, based on psychological impression. Even when its deeper implications are realized, that does not itself make one capable of exemplifying the " grammar " culled from the living reality, Jesus. It is speech, not grammar, which constitutes our measure; this, not our opinions, decides what use God can make of us. As Paul knew, we have to walk according to such reality as we have attained; in God's world, if we do not press forward, we slide backward (Phil. iii, 16). Even if we know the grammar thoroughly, the language may be dead, or treated as a foreign language—to be used alternately

with Mammon's. Even in our baby stage, this divine conversation must embrace the whole of life. Only on that basis can fluency, idiom and correct accent be obtained, through increasing commerce with its Native Realm. By God's own Providence, we cannot flee the world or our fellow men; we are all pulling each other backward or forward; the systems we produce bring nemesis on our heads, just because they are not shaped as schoolmasters to bring us to co-operation with God's Providence. That shaping is part of our responsibility. Meanwhile, our text shows that growth in sonship, in co-operation with God's Providence, only frees us from the leaven of evil in order to increase our responsibility for, and identification with, the world; the weak are to be saved by those who are strong.

J. E. Yates.

SURVEY OF BOOKS ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Interest in religious education has received a stimulus from the war, and articles on the subject in the public press have been eagerly discussed. Apart from the major issue, What is meant by religious education? (a most important field of inquiry as yet scarcely considered by our English writers on the subject), there are two matters of urgent importance claiming the attention of the religious bodies and also of the Local Education Authorities—viz., the Archbishops' Proposals on Christian Education and the future of non-provided schools. It is known that the Board of Education is also giving these matters close attention and has issued a document, "Education after the War" (private and confidential), surveying the whole field of education.

The publication, therefore, of Canon E. F. Braley's book *A Policy in Religious Education* (University of London Press, 5s.) is indeed timely. Moreover, on the face of it, there are few people better qualified to discuss problems of religious education and to suggest a policy. Canon Braley has been in close touch with schools and training colleges for the past twenty-five years, and, as a former Professor of Education in Durham University and the Principal of Bede College, his opportunities for gaining knowledge of the educational position have been exceptional. The book before us could not have been written except by one possessing a wide knowledge and experience of the problems arising out of religious education. The chapters dealing with the Church and the teacher, work among adults, and youth movements are of first-rate importance and deserve careful study. The "policy", however, outlined by Canon Braley on the particular matters which are most urgent is, briefly stated, that the "dual system" should be brought to an end, on conditions very similar to the Archbishops' Proposals, except that

the latter implied the continued existence of provided and non-provided schools.

That there are objections to " dual control " is admitted by many who are eager to maintain Church schools; but Canon Braley paints a very gloomy picture, exaggerating the defects, and quoting little bits of evidence (some of it obsolete) in order to blacken the outlook for Church schools. He has some words of commendation, but these only damn the whole system with faint praise. The fact is, Canon Braley is opposed to denominational teaching in schools, and he makes this clear in a very curious chapter entitled " Denominational Principles ". He tells us that the Anglican system is based on Sacraments, and that " teaching about the Sacraments is provided in all modern agreed syllabuses of religious knowledge " (p. 91). He also argues that Holy Communion can be best " taught " by the scholars being present at it. All this is no doubt true. It is precisely the principle for which Church schools stand. Yet Canon Braley would not only prohibit the denominational instruction in schools, but he is also opposed to the operation of Section XIII of the Education Act, 1936, which permits the withdrawal of scholars for attendance at Holy Communion and denominational instruction in church or elsewhere.

There are so many controversial issues raised by Canon Braley that it would require a volume to answer them. He clearly writes under the influence of his former Bishop, Dr Hensley Henson, from whose book *The Church of England* he freely quotes. As, however, Canon Braley is the Principal of a Church Training College, the question arises, What is the point in maintaining Church Training Colleges if the Church teachers trained therein are to be debarred from giving Church teaching in schools ?

Canon R. D. Richardson is a well-known Modernist, and his book *Christian Belief and Practice* (James Clarke and Co., 7s. 6d.) contains many marks of Modernism upon it, including a Creed for To-day (pp. 102-3). The book contains lessons given by the author to young people and is divided into two parts. Part I contains lessons on the Christian Faith, and Part II lessons on the Christian Church and the Christian Life. The lessons are most admirably set out, and, if one accepts Canon Richardson's standpoint, the book is exceedingly valuable. There are long bibliographies and numerous prayers. On the whole, however, the books are of a Modernist type, even J. M. Thompson appearing on the Miracles. Read critically, we can commend the book to the clergy, although we should not care to put it into the hands of a Sunday-school teacher.

There is one particularly interesting lesson on " Good Manners " (p. 151), which some of Canon Richardson's friends advised him not to publish. It may strike some as a little superior in tone; but much of the lesson is good and necessary,

since the vast majority of children are allowed to grow up hopelessly ignorant of the elements of " good manners ".

From Mowbray's we have received a small book intended for the preparation of older or adult candidates for Confirmation, entitled *Years of Discretion* (2s. 6d.), by the author of *The Way*. The plan of instruction is in three sections—Doctrine, Christian Life, and Prayer; and the aim is to encourage an intellectual as well as a practical and devotional outlook. Not all will find the arguments impressive, but one grows accustomed, as one reads on, to the author's mode of argument. The practical and devotional teaching is excellent—there is a valuable section on meditation. This is a small book, but it contains a mine of sound doctrine. We commend it heartily.

The remaining books to which we draw attention are all published by the National Society and S.P.C.K.—the two great educational societies of the Church which in recent years have entered into a happy partnership. *The Teaching of the Church Catechism* (3s.) is by Canon A. R. Browne-Wilkinson, who has written largely on religious education. Part I consists of an outline of the teaching contained in the Catechism. This is simple and straightforward, sound and workmanlike, without being particularly suggestive or interesting. Part II gives the text of the Catechism with notes. Here again the exposition is sound, without being in any way arresting. Some years ago Canon Redlich wrote a book dealing with the history of the Catechism, in which he gives a full exposition of the mysterious N. or M. and a suggestive explanation of the seventh commandment being out of order in the Duty towards my Neighbour. If a second edition is called for, Canon Browne-Wilkinson might consult this book to advantage.

For over half a century the adequacy of the Catechism as an instrument for the instruction of the young has been under discussion. Modern educational method, it is argued by Canon Braley and others, no longer favours the question-and-answer form of instruction. Suggestions have been made for the revision of the Catechism. So far, however, the only step taken is the compilation of " A Supplementary Instruction " issued by leave of the Lower House of York Convocation and recommended for experimental use. Canon Browne-Wilkinson has included this in his exposition of the Catechism. It is instructive, alongside Canon Browne-Wilkinson's book, to read *The Church Catechism Explained*, by Canon A. W. Robinson, issued forty years ago, and by no means superseded by more recent works.

We do not agree with all the more provocative sentences and phrases in *The Ten Commandments in the Twentieth Century* (1s. 6d.), by John Drewett, yet it is indeed a book to be read and re-read. It is lively, relevant, up-to-date, provocative, and gives the Ten Commandments a new significance for our age. Communism,

Fascism, social and economic problems, capital punishment, war and peace, are all discussed by a mind singularly alert and persuasive. A well-written book (and very cheap), which could be used as a basis of instruction from the pulpit or in the Bible Class.

Miss Margaret Avery, Scripture specialist in a Girls' High School, and formerly a Lecturer at Brighton Diocesan Training College, has gathered the fruits of her experience into a small volume entitled *Lesson Notes on the Old Testament* (3s.). Emphasis is laid upon the Prophets, and care is taken to provide the historical background. Courses of instruction and study are suggested, and there is a useful bibliography. The book contains enlightened teaching on the Old Testament, but we can only commend it to those who are prepared to read it carefully.

In recent years there have been compiled some excellent books of prayers for schools; and one of the most encouraging signs is the readiness of Local Education Authorities to issue, along with syllabuses of religious instruction, service books. Mr R. L. Arundale, Headmaster of the Model Senior School, St John's College, York, has written an exceedingly valuable little book, *School Worship Day by Day* (2s. 6d.), in which are included services (introduction, Bible readings, hymns and prayers) for all occasions. We cordially commend this book to school managers and schoolmasters.

Our last book, by the Rev. F. Barrie Flint, is *Talks on the Sunday Gospels* (5s.) for children's services. These addresses are short, attractively written, full of sound teaching, and arresting. Mr Flint hopes that the book will be used not only by the clergy, but also by parents who need guidance in instructing their children. Enrolling members of the Mothers' Union should take note of it.

W. J. Brown.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHURCH IN COUNTRY PARISHES

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The Report of the Bishop of Winchester's Committee, published as " The Church in Country Parishes ", has produced two papers in Theology: one, by the late Canon H. L. Hubbard, in the July number, on " The Training of the Village Priest ", and the other, entitled " Problems of a Country Parson ", by Fr H. de Candole, in that for November. Perhaps you would permit some supplementary remarks by one of those seminarists, seemingly so few in number, who sincerely believe themselves called to the rural ministry.

Inexperienced as we necessarily are (apart from the upbringing in country parsonages enjoyed by some of us), we can have little to offer by way of criticism of the Report. We support most strongly its condemnation of the scheme for larger grouping of rural parishes under a college of clergy. This was obviously conceived by urban-minded theorists. We should be inclined to question the desirability of depriving the country parson of his glebe, in order to vest its control in some central body; for we are both suspicious of every fresh step towards centralization in such matters and willing to cling to the old links with the land which the possession of glebe maintains. As a general inquiry, we wonder whether the Bishop's committee is more right, in its view of the advantages to be derived from life on the land by the average worker, than the compilers of the Astor and Rowntree Report on British Agriculture.

With regard to our actual training, the topic mainly discussed by Canon Hubbard, we feel that special seminaries for candidates who intend to work in rural parishes are unlikely to be set apart, as long as the whole body of colleges continues to be representative of the ecclesiastical party system; and that is as good as saying, as long as teaching in the Church of England continues to differ noticeably, among various schools of thought, on important points of doctrine and practice. This being so, the best possible use must be made of the existing seminaries. Certain of them have, and use, opportunities for pastoral experience in rural areas; but we question whether those who direct this part of the student's preparation regard themselves as doing anything but training town clergy in regrettably unreal conditions. Let them, instead, make it plain that preaching, singing services, and even reading lessons, to congregations of a dozen is not bad training for dealing with large town flocks, but good training for dealing with small country ones.

Secondly, the teaching inside the colleges is given by town-minded men (as Canon Hubbard points out), who necessarily act on the assumption that the average student will take a title to some town church. Therefore, we require up-to-date books on the " pastoralia " of rural parishes, to replace what we do not receive in our lectures and lessons. There is no doubt but that the changes in rural life since 1918, described by the Winchester Report, have modified the character of the rural ministry; George Herbert, and even Canon Skrine, need to be supplemented.

Thirdly, those who seriously intend to devote themselves to rural work require a very much wider and deeper intellectual training than is necessary for the urban clergy This is because, unlike the latter, we really have some prospect of being able to study and to think. Without ceaseless engagements, clubs, guilds, and so forth, we shall be in danger of providing material for Satan's activity unless we are thoroughly imbued with a

devotion to reading and thought. From this point of view, it may even be desirable to prefer men with good academic qualifications in filling rural livings. The energetic man without the ability or the desire to continue serious study after ordination ought to keep away from the country parishes, where there will surely be insufficient work, of the kind that suits him, to keep him from yielding to idleness. The same is, of course, true, perhaps even more true, of ascetic and spiritual preparation. Admittedly the country parish lacks that atmosphere of unrest which, in the towns, is always said to play havoc with the inner life of a man ill disciplined; but in the country, accidia is an even more deadly foe, and one which we seminarists already fear.

Lastly, we need in the colleges positive encouragement about our vocation, both from teachers and from fellow-students. We do not want to be classed with pensioners and "returned empties". Nor do we, who claim to be Catholics, wish to be despised because our belief in this special vocation leads us to take small interest in the party gossip of London and other big centres, in monstrances and lace albs, in stunts and acts of rebellion. Again, let us not be thought unspiritual if, when our contemporaries are rushing from one good work to another, we are still as keen as schoolboys on the old employments and the old diversions of the countryside. Few of us can pretend to the brilliant gifts of Robert Hawker or Bernard Walke—their magnetic personalities, their power of attracting attention without surrendering dignity—and, in so far as we assess our abilities rightly, we shall probably be able only to proceed along the cautious lines at which the Winchester Committee and your contributors hint. If the old methods, of which some urban priests and urban seminarists have such an opinionated dislike, cannot be swept away in the twinkling of an eye from the country parishes without disaster, let us not be thought the worse of for being prepared to make them our starting-point.

Your obedient servant,
ROBERT M. CATLING.

ST STEPHEN'S HOUSE,
OXFORD.
November 12, 1941.

KARL BARTH'S LETTER

A Letter to Professor Quick in Answer to his Review of Karl Barth's Letter to Great Britain

DEAR PROFESSOR QUICK,

You have reviewed in THEOLOGY Barth's letter to Great Britain from Switzerland. Your review raises fundamental questions, and I am among those who have been stirred up

by some of your remarks, especially as I have learned much from your books. Hence you may kindly understand that I take the liberty of writing to you.

I believe I know Barth, whom I first met in 1919, well enough to guess that if he is able to read your review he will say: "Just that response I expected to get generally from Great Britain!" In this exclamation there would be both appreciation of the spiritual depth of the review and irony about some ineradicable prejudices frequently entertained by English scholars.

Barth and I have had many vigorous discussions, and we have differences as deep as a Calvinist and a Lutheran notoriously have (not only on the Sacrament). On the other side, there are strong agreements between us, too. For all that, I am neither a Barthian nor an anti-Barthian; Barth may consider me to be something of a semi-Anglican! Thus, I believe I have some reasons for taking the liberty of meditating on your review, not on behalf of Barth, but on behalf of the much-to-be-desired better understanding—and better criticizing, too!—of his theology in Great Britain as well as generally on behalf of the better mutual understanding between English and Continental (both Lutheran and Calvinist) theologians. May I hope that you kindly will not mind my writing to you, and will understand my intention?

You declare in your review that you approve of Barth's letter with your heart as much as you have to disapprove of it with your head. You will understand that I feel uneasy about a division between the voice of the heart and that of the head in things of the Church, because I am afraid that this division may lead easily to those reserved judgments which can hide the deeper reasons for criticism. Yet if I myself were asked about my own reaction to Barth's theologizing, I should have to declare that I could accept most of it with my head rather than with my heart. You, therefore, will see that the effect which your review will have on Continental theologians is not a simple one.

I do not want, however, to dwell on this point, but to go on towards what is indicated by you as "the fundamental point at issue", and although everyone will realize that "any further considerations of these points would take us deep into a discussion of the first principles of Christian theology, which is not possible here" (p. 312), you may not be troubled to see that your readers take seriously what you have noticed on the ground of principles.

I therefore beg to analyse, and dwell on, the two sentences in which you have put down your fundamental criticism—viz., "The fundamental point at issue is whether God's self-revelation to man is, as Barth seems to assume, a *single* revelation in the cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ, or rather *twofold*, first in the Natural Law of creation given in the Logos 'by whom all

things were made', and secondly in the personal descent of that same Logos for the redemption of man who had sinned against His law. Barth's insistence on the singleness of the divine revelation obliges him to find the sole source of all valid authority in the crucified and risen Christ" (THEOLOGY, xliii, 311 *f.*). I propose, for this purpose, to cut your two sentences into several points, partly to unfold the very compressed context of them, partly to view them from another standpoint.

(1) I find in your fundamental statement the following main thoughts:

(*a*) There is a natural law of divine origin.

(*b*) This divine origin of the law is derived from creation; it is to be called the law of creation.

(*c*) Consequently, there are two sources of authority, the one a revelation "given in the Logos by whom all things were made", the other a revelation given "in the personal descent of that same Logos for the redemption of man who has sinned against his law".

(*d*) You are decided to separate strictly the Law from the Gospel, and to refer this separation to the separation between the two sources of authority, or the two revelations.

(*e*) You understand Barth's rejection of the natural law and his reference to the danger of having human ideals instead of a divine law as a denial of the divine origin of the law.

I add to these points, which seem to me to be quite clear, two others, in which I am not quite sure whether I understand you aright:

(*f*) I suppose that you are inclined to equate the two revelations maintained by you with—

(i) a revelation before and another after the fall, and
(ii) a revelation by reason, and another revelation by grace, the very revelation in Christ Jesus.

(2) I beg to add my arguments to these points.

(*a*) I agree; and Barth does, too.

(*b*) I agree and I disagree in so far as the law is founded, according to my understanding, partly on creation, but on legislation as well, consequently it is partly ordained for man without sin, partly for the sinner.

(*c*) I entirely disagree, for there is, according to my understanding of the Creeds, no separation inside the Logos, between the only begotten Son who is the Logos in creation and the crucified and risen Lord who is the Logos in redemption. The Godhead and God's acts of salvation are tripartite in the Trinity, but Christ, the Logos, is never tripartite or bipartite, but One in two natures. The fact of the Incarnation must not be used in order to produce two Christ-revelations, one in the Christ not yet incarnate and another in the Christ incarnate. Therefore, St Paul could call together and let coincide, from the

standpoint of revelation, marriage, which surely belongs to the law of creation, and the mystery of Christ (Eph. v).

There are not two accesses to Christ. Such a supposition would contradict both the Creed and the Liturgy.

(*d*) I disagree, not because of the assumption of a division between Law and Gospel (which division is quite necessary), but because of the attribution of two sources of authority and two revelations to those two works of God, the Law and the Gospel.

I find there is a certain confusion of *theologici loci*—viz., of Bibliology, Soteriology and Christology. The question as to whether there are one or two revelations belongs to Bibliology; the question as to whether Law and Gospel are divided belongs to Soteriology; the question of the Logos belongs to Christology.

(*e*) I cannot think but that there is a misunderstanding of Barth. For Barth, natural law is only a human-made ideal because it is understood to be natural, founded on reason, and not on the word of God, but for Barth it is divine so far as it is Law indeed.

(*f*) (A) What is revealed to man before the fall? I see three things:

(i) *Imago Dei—i.e.*, the community between God and man arising from the fact that God addresses man and man can hear;

(ii) the rule of man as the vicar of God over the whole of the earth;

(iii) and the order between man and woman—viz., marriage.

But all those things which belong to the sphere of the State and politics are derived from the law which is given for sinners after the fall. Since Barth's letter is concerned only with these things, I cannot see the alleged contradiction between Barth's arguments and the law of creation which you maintain to be the safeguard of the first revelation.

(B) Luther has said that for Aristotle creation is a *fabula absurdissima*, too. Is the Mosaic Law, or the law given in the covenant of Noah, anyhow less a *fabula absurdissima* for the philosopher?

I don't know, but there is seemingly a tension, the very old tension, between the God of philosophers and the God of the Bible, but that is only a guess of mine. I will not conjure the ghost of Pascal. But the singleness of revelation is quite compatible with a division between the acts of God's salvatory work—namely, the creation, the various covenants, the Incarnation, the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, and the consummation.

The alleged doctrine of a twofold revelation secures the divine origin of the law much less effectively than the doctrine of the singleness of revelation, and Paul has done more for the singleness of revelation by the idea of Christ as the agent of creation,

according to the Epistle to the Colossians, than can be done by the God of the philosophers, and their idea of a general revelation outside Christ. Summing up, I repeat that I feel a very strong resistance against an assumption of a twofold access to Christ, of which even Aquinas has nowhere spoken.

(3) To clear up my own position in the matters of doctrine, I may state that I am not fully satisfied by Barth's theology with respect to Christ's humiliation and exaltation, that I feel that the Incarnation is undervalued in his theology, and that generally the relations between the stages of salvation, as from the very beginning of God's action till its end, are partly confused, and telescoped. There are serious problems—*e.g.*, about man's sanctification, and the resurrection of the Lord Himself; there is also lack of clarity about what is redemption indeed; but all these problematical points are the consequence of our common and general weakness in doctrine, in which each of the churches has its guilt, together with the others. And when Barth—I said so to a principal of a theological college recently—is accused because his consciousness of guilt is exaggerated, let us recognize that all the defenders of natural theology, beginning with St Thomas, must be also accused that their knowledge of sin was inadequate. But, while complaining of the former error, I reject the latter.

(4) I see some of my apprehensions confirmed by my casual, but, as I believe typical, experience that one of the leading British theologians (and a Free Churchman to boot) declared to me not long ago that he was bound to be neutral in the German Church struggle in order to avoid consenting to Barth's contesting of natural theology. I fear that in such a case the voice of the head has had a paralysing effect.

It is not Barth's letter, but your review of it which has forced me to touch on so many theological main terms, but I think it is Barth, too, if not his letter, at any rate he as its writer, who forces you, me and all of us to go to the bottom of the doctrine, even in a review, or in a review of a review.

Believe me to be,
Yours sincerely,
HANS EHRENBERG.

THE COTTAGE,
REDBROOK,
WHITCHURCH, SALOP.
November 24, 1941.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I am grateful to Dr Ehrenberg for his letter, but I cannot help wishing that he had devoted more of it to explaining

Barth's theology, and less to criticizing mine. After all, it is Barth's theology which is important. And, after reading what Dr Ehrenberg says, I am afraid that I understand no better than before what exactly Barth means by " Natural Law " or by his doctrine that the State is " the sign of the consecration which the world has received through the resurrection of Jesus Christ ". Probably Dr Ehrenberg will regard this confession as further proof of my " ineradicable prejudices ". But what I think most Anglicans, like myself, need is an explanation which begins a little " further back ", or, in other words, is more elementary.

Meanwhile, as Dr Ehrenberg has courteously criticized me, I must attempt some answer to his questions.

(1) In reply to his principal criticism I can only point out that I carefully avoided the expression " two revelations ", and never even dreamed that I should be accused of teaching " two sources of authority ". God forbid. There is one source of authority, God the Logos, by whom all things were made, who for us men and for our salvation was incarnate. I suggested that this single Source of authority had made Himself known to man by a twofold revelation. Of course, at this point the real theological problem concerns the question how far and in what sense Christians are to allow that non-Christians have been illuminated by the divine Logos. Dr Ehrenberg uncompromisingly rejects the kind of answer to this question which I suggested. He does not indicate what his own answer, or Barth's, would be.

(2) I do not believe that God's law for man's nature (Natural Law) is essentially different after the Fall from what it was before. I do, of course, believe that man's perception of it has been greatly obscured by the Fall, though not *altogether* perverted. The precise relation of Natural Law (in this sense) to the Mosaic Law (which is part of the Covenant anticipating Redemption) is a question which, I think requires far more attention than it has received from Anglican theologians.

(3) The other main point which Dr Ehrenberg raises concerns the old problem of reason and revelation. Here, above all, I think, we need a most careful examination and definition of terms in order to understand one another. All the great antitheses between nature and grace, reason and revelation, faith and reason, are liable to be understood in quite different ways. Dr Ehrenberg adds a fresh antithesis which, I confess, is new to me, that between revelation by reason and revelation by grace. Probably he only means to attribute it to me. But, if so, I fear I cannot accept it. How can we possibly say that nothing of God's reason is revealed in His grace, that grace is a purely non-rational means of revelation, or that nothing is revealed by God's grace to the human reason ?

(4) It is only too likely that I have erred by confusing Bibliology, Soteriology and Christology. I am afraid that the precise

delimitation of their respective spheres, which Dr Ehrenberg evidently has in mind, is quite obscure to me.

All my reply amounts to is this: much patient discussion of terms is necessary before Continental and Anglican theologians really understand one another. Unfortunately, Englishmen are particularly prone to be impatient of any such discussion. But with the help of grace and reason we must do our best.

I am, Sir,
Yours very truly,
OLIVER C. QUICK.

CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.
December 1, 1941.

BOOK REVIEWS

ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS: A THEOLOGICAL COMMENTARY. By F. C. Synge. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This commentary is theological in the slightly technical sense that the word has lately acquired. It is not, that is, designed to elaborate from the Apostle's text propositions that belong to the system or science of Christian theology; it is an exposition of the Epistle as it stands, but one which underlines the fact that God is the true subject of the sentences composing it. This is not, in the commentator's view, a *tour de force*, but a declaration of what the Epistle essentially means. His expositions are in evident sympathy with Dr Karl Barth's, but he is readier than that great man to allow the scripture to speak for itself; there is less wresting of the plain sense.

The theme of the Epistle is Unity, but it is important, in the commentator's view, to avoid the soft and soothing impression which the Apostle's round phrases are capable of producing. The unity is not a comfortable human fact, nor, alternatively, a comfortably remote ideal, nor does it soften the sharp antithesis between sinful man and holy God. The unity is the act of God through Christ, whereby He has placed in the unity of His saving purpose a multitude of sinful and often discordant men. It is no part of the Apostle's purpose to laud the actual evidences of sanctification and mutual charity visible in the Churches, still less to commend the unitary structure of the ecclesiastical institution.

All this is very well made out. In spite of its brief and unpretentious form, this commentary is really an important work, and reveals the most strenuous intellectual vigour. Its interpretations are never conventional, and one never disagrees with them without seeing deeper into the text than one did before.

For example, in view of the several texts associating Christ as "Head" with the Church as "Body" it is impossible to accept the commentator's thesis that the Church is not spoken of as Christ's Body, the Body of members belonging to Him as their "Head". But at the same time he must be allowed to have shown that (*a*) one sense, and perhaps the primary sense, of "head" in these passages is "substance," (in the sense in which a summary expresses the substance of a book); (*b*) that St Paul is less interested in declaring the Church to be *the* body of Christ, than in describing it as *a* mutually complementary organism of members, belonging to Christ. The trouble is that St Paul's words carry so many trains of association at once, that to try to pin him down to one (as here is done) is impossible; we must content ourselves with showing which is dominant—if we can.

There is an appendix, less convincing than the commentary as a whole in upholding the Pauline authorship. Read the commentary itself, and then disbelieve the Pauline authorship if you can. The appendix wishes to save Ephesians with the sacrifice of Colossians; an entertaining effort of wit and a turning of the tables on the usual opinion, but not really more. We must find a way to let St Paul keep both epistles.

AUSTIN FARRER.

OXFORD.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE IMPOSSIBLE—A REPLY TO REINHOLD NIEBUHR. By G. H. C. Macgregor. The Fellowship of Reconciliation. 2s.

WAR, PACIFISM AND PEACE. By Robert Corkey. S.P.C.K. 4s.

The Relevance of the Impossible has quite obviously been written hot from the heart. Dr Thouless has taught us to view askance arguments which are fortified by the use of words of "high feeling tone". But in this case the use of some such may be forgiven when we consider the fierceness of the attack launched by Dr Niebuhr in his tract *Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist*, and also in *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*. Dr Macgregor's book is indeed a fine illustration of the retort courteous. It is difficult not to feel that both as regards letter and spirit Dr Macgregor is far closer to the New Testament than Dr Niebuhr.

Forcefully and convincingly Dr Macgregor puts forward not a theology of "perfectionism" so much as a reasoned appeal to the New Testament to justify his faith in human nature as being redeemable by grace manifesting itself in love. That is and must remain the basis of the Christian approach to unredeemed humanity. There is no facile optimism in this approach. It has always involved and it must always involve a cross both for the one who loves and also for the one who is loved.

But it is when he tries to relate theology to the practical issue of the right attitude of the Christian in a world prone to war that Dr Macgregor's argument becomes rather less convincing. He asserts without qualification that the crucial ethical question of the last twenty-five years has been war, although he admits later on that war, like tyranny, is a child of our modern society. The truth is rather that war has been the dominant emotional issue, and that has obscured the fact that it was never the crucial ethical one. It might fairly be argued that tyranny is as crucial an issue, and even more strongly it might be claimed that we should attack the organization of the acquisitive society rather than its misbegotten children.

Dr Macgregor is least convincing in handling the question " Why isolate war ?" And there is surely a misuse of words when he asks the question " Ought a Christian to participate in an acknowledged evil in the hope of escaping from a hypothetically greater evil ?" There is nothing hypothetical about the black-out of liberty wherever the Nazi philosophy is dominant.

It is a pity also that Dr Macgregor does not make sufficient allowance for the remarkable progress implicit in the recognition by authority that " pacifism is a vocation ". That in itself is a considerable achievement and upon that we are approaching a *consensus fidelium.*

There are many who, for this and other reasons, refuse to despair, and who repudiate the implication in Dr Macgregor's phrase that on this issue of war " the Christian Church must make its final stand "; and to the question " Is victory in total war possible to a nation which keeps its charity alive ?" answer a humble but unequivocal " Yes ".

Some of these " many " will turn with gratitude to Professor Corkey, and will even feel that in his book *War, Pacifism and Peace* he shows himself a sounder leader to follow than Dr Niebuhr. But, more important than that, Professor Corkey provides a Christian complement to the brilliant study of recent political thought by Professor E. H. Carr in his *Twenty Years' Crisis.* In that book religion was virtually dismissed as incurably utopian in its relation to politics. Professor Corkey provides a Christian realism that is badly needed now and will be indispensable if there is ever to be a reconstruction of Europe after the war.

M. A. C. Warren.

Cambridge.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher